

No system of supports for agricultural products can operate successfully without accompanying controls. The higher the support the more rigid the controls. We have already seen this type of support program sag of its own weight. Diminishing returns to the farmer, mounting surpluses and continued high cost of food to the consumer have been to a large extent due to the present price-support programs.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the answer lies not in continued high rigid supports, but in better distribution and merchandising of our farm products to the consuming public which provides the farmer his fair share of the cost of his product without Federal subsidies. A better job of selling can help the farmer. Rigid supports mean rigid production controls and the little farmer is all too often forced to reduce his operation to one of unsound economic practice. The sliding scale of supports adopted last

year may not be the complete or final answer, but does it make sense to discard it before it has even had a chance to operate for one crop season?

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert an editorial on this subject from the New York Times of March 13, entitled "Farm Surpluses":

#### FARM SURPLUSES

The magnitude of the problem faced by Washington in dealing with farm surpluses is revealed in the latest figures on Government-owned farm products. At the end of 1954 the Government held title to some \$4,230,000,000 worth of farm surplus food and fiber and was incurring a daily bill of \$700,000 to store them. Moreover, there was almost \$3 billion outstanding in farm product loans. Thus more than \$7 billion in Federal funds was committed to the farm-price-support program and this figure represented an increase of \$1,500,000,000 in 1 year. Put another way, each American had a \$44.50 stake in the farm problem by the end of last year.

The present administration has made strenuous efforts to reduce the staggering surplus inventory, but so far has been able to dispose of only relatively small amounts. The Government's disposal program has been slowed by the necessity to avoid depressing farm product prices in the world market since this would alienate friendly nations who must sell their own agricultural products abroad. An attempt is being made to open and to develop new markets for our surpluses, but this at best is a difficult, long-range project. Meanwhile, it is anticipated that the Government will have to take over many of the agricultural products on which it has granted loans, and that its total investment will run to \$9 billion before any leveling off begins.

Clearly, farm surpluses remain one of our major domestic problems. Lower price supports becoming effective this year and increased Government disposal activities should tend to check our mounting storage of crops. However, it is plain that the farm-price-support program will burden the American taxpayer for years to come.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 25, 1955

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, whose mercy and love are from everlasting to everlasting: Coming from all the tangled paths our weary feet are treading, with so much that is unpredictable and unsure, we would be sure of Thee even amid the flood of mortal ills prevailing. Preserve us, O God, for in Thee do we put our trust. We would have the divine real to us, dominant in us, controlling us, comforting us, stabilizing and sustaining us. To this end, we lay our burdens and tasks before Thee, not that we may leave them here—they are our responsibility, and we would carry them with gallant hearts—but that having seen them in the light of Thy grace and power, having received, for the carrying of them, new strength and courage, we may find that even weights may be changed to wings and statutes to songs, as we run and are not weary and as we walk and do not faint. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 24, 1955, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4725. An act to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 4951. An act directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955-56 marketing year, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5085. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 4725. An act to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4951. An act directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955-56 marketing year, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

H. R. 5085. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, so that the Senate may consider certain noncontroversial nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

#### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

#### IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotions in the Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations for promotions in the Air Force be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations for promotions in the Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

## REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO MONTHLY PAYMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

## AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO THE PAYMENT OF CERTAIN MILEAGE ALLOWANCES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

## AUDIT REPORT ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## CERTIFICATION OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, certifying, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be benefited by the Helena Valley unit, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## INCREASE OF EFFICIENCY OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO THE IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTIES IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of

civil penalties in certain cases (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, relating to the authorization of the Colorado River storage project, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. CHAVEZ on March 24, 1955, p. 3621, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations:

## "House Concurrent Resolution 28

"Whereas the flood-control program of the United States has saved much of the land in various areas for productive purposes; and

"Whereas said flood-control program has also greatly aided in the elimination of the dangers of overflow and the destruction of crops and various other properties in such areas, thereby increasing the productiveness of such areas and protecting the welfare of the United States; and

"Whereas there is great need for additional electrical power in the vicinity of the Greers Ferry and for the expansion of existing facilities for distribution of such power; and

"Whereas there has been considerable progress made in the development of the White River Basin; and

"Whereas additional dams are needed for the development of the White River Basin; and

"Whereas the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the White River Basin, approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, was modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Greers Ferry Reservoir; and

"Whereas Greers Ferry Reservoir has been approved by the Congress of the United States as recommended by the United States Engineers; and

"Whereas there was \$30,000 included in the President's budget message for planning for the Greers Ferry project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 60th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That we urge the Congress of the United States to give careful consideration to the importance of the Greers Ferry project.

"SEC. 2. That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to provide sufficient appropriation to initiate the construction of Greers Ferry Dam and Reservoir.

"SEC. 3. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded, or delivered by an official representative, to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the House of Rep-

resentatives and the Senate of the United States representing the State of Arkansas.

"CARL W. WHILLOCK.

"WINFORD B. LOGAN."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Works:

## "House Concurrent Resolution 10

"Whereas there is an immediate need for dual-purpose dams on many of the mountain streams of Arkansas and whereas such need is increasing yearly for the purpose of both flood control and cheaper power; and

"Whereas the present formula of estimating the cost of such projects virtually prohibits the construction of any more of such structures in this State; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States House Resolution 851, which was introduced by the Honorable J. W. TRIMBLE, Congressman from the Third Arkansas District, that would correct this unreasonable injustice and permit the further construction of these meritorious projects: Now, therefore, the house of representatives of the 60th Arkansas General Assembly (the Senate concurring therein), does, by this resolution, endorse said House Resolution 851, and urge the immediate passage of the same; be it further

"Resolved, That when this resolution has passed both houses of this 60th general assembly, the chief clerk of the house of representatives is hereby instructed to immediately transmit a copy of same to each of the very able Members of Congress of Arkansas.

"GORDON STANLEY."

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress in favor of the immediate passage of legislation for the development of fine arts programs and projects

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill to provide for the establishment of a program of Federal grants for the development of fine arts programs and projects; and

Whereas the enactment of such legislation would be to the advantage of this Commonwealth: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the establishment of a program of Federal grants for the development of fine arts programs and projects; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHOEPEL:

S. 1552. A bill for the relief of Mikle Woodard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1553. A bill authorizing an appropriation of \$5 million to repair hurricane damage along the coast of North Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works.



By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1554. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, chapter 79, to add a new section, 1623, to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1555. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; and

S. 1556. A bill to grant minerals, including oil and gas on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 1557. A bill to amend section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

### EXTENSION OF LAW RELATING TO PERJURY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the unfortunate features of present laws relating to proof of perjury is a requirement that where two individuals have made contradictory statements under oath, a person may not be convicted for perjury unless the indictment charges, and the Government proves, which of the two statements is false. This requirement is wholly unnecessary, in my judgment, since one of the statements must, of necessity, be false.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, chapter 79, to add a new section, 1623, to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath, on the sound recommendation of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, for the purpose of eliminating this unnecessary requirement. I should like to point out, however, that all other necessary protections for defendants would remain in the law. I trust there will be early action on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD, together with the letter sent by the Attorney General to the Vice President, recommending its passage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1554) to amend title 18, United States Code, chapter 79, to add a new section, 1623, to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That title 18, United States Code, chapter 79, is amended by adding immediately after section 1622 the following:

"§ 1623. Contradictory statements

"Whoever willfully makes oath or affirmation to a statement on a material matter

before a grand jury, during the trial of a case, or before either House of Congress or a congressional committee or subcommittee, and does within any 3-year period willfully make oath or affirmation to a contradictory statement on a material matter before a grand jury, during the trial of a case, or before either House of Congress or a congressional committee or subcommittee, is guilty of perjury, and shall be punished as provided in Section 1621. Such perjury may be established by proof of the willful making of such contradictory statements without alleging or proving which one thereof is false."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 79 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1621 of such title, is amended by adding the following new item: "1623. Contradictory statements."

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

MARCH 4, 1955.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I proposed to the 83d Congress the enactment of legislation to amend chapter 79 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath. Unfortunately, such legislation was not enacted despite the fact that it is greatly needed. I respectfully urge the early enactment of the enclosed bill in this session of the Congress.

Under existing law, a person may not be convicted of perjury for making contradictory statements under oath unless the indictment charges and the Government proves which of the statements is false. The falsity of an allegedly perjurious statement must be established by two independent witnesses or by one witness and corroborative circumstances.

The proposed amendment of the law relating to perjury will provide that proof of the contradictory nature of two willfully made statements would alone support a perjury conviction. This seems to me to be a sensible and warranted change. It in no way reduces the protection afforded defendants by the two-witness rule mentioned above, nor does it shift from the prosecution the burden of proof incident to criminal cases. It merely eliminates what appears to be a ridiculous requirement that proof be adduced as to which of two statements is false when one of such statements must, of necessity, be so.

You will note that to support a conviction the statements must have been made within a period of 3 years of one another, and they must have been made willfully, on oath or affirmation, on material matters, and in proceedings before grand juries, courts, or congressional bodies.

I would be most appreciative of the prompt introduction of this proposal and its consideration by the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,  
Attorney General.

### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 9 (h) OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, together with an editorial from

the Washington Evening Star of February 22, 1955, and an excerpt of the subcommittee report, which became Document No. 26, of the 83d Congress, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial and excerpt will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1557) to amend section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

On behalf of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself, I have introduced a bill to amend section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act as amended, in order to strengthen the anti-Communist provisions of existing law and I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

This bill was introduced during the 83d Congress and not acted upon by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. I regret this lack of action by the committee because it has resulted in the National Labor Relations Board continuing to face the difficulty in its effort to enforce the intent of Congress and to prevent Communist-dominated unions from using the facilities of the NLRB. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Washington Star of February 22, 1955, which describes the difficulty being faced by the Board in the case of the International Fur and Leather Workers.

(See exhibit A.)

The non-Communist affidavit in our labor-management law cannot in fact be fully effective so long as the Board is powerless to face up to the falsity of an affidavit when it is false and to hold that a union is not in compliance with the requirements of law if its officers file false affidavits. In the most recent case, Mr. Ben Gold was convicted in April 1954 of signing a false affidavit in 1950 that he was not a Communist. Following that conviction, he was reelected as an officer of his union and filed another non-Communist affidavit. The Board rejected his 1954 affidavit on the assumption that it was false in view of the earlier conviction for filing a false affidavit. The courts held that until Congress acts to disqualify a union because an officer filed a false affidavit, the Board cannot act to reach that result.

Our bill provides that the National Labor Relations Board has the power to declare that a non-Communist affidavit signed by a union officer does not satisfy the requirements of the law if that official refuses to testify under oath whether he signed the affidavit, or whether it is a true statement of fact, or if the union officer has been convicted of perjury in executing the affidavit.

Members of the Senate will recall that during the 82d Congress the senior Senator from Illinois and I had the honor of serving on the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations. It was my privilege to be the chairman of the subcommittee. We held extensive hearings and made thorough studies of public policy and Communist domination of certain unions. It was our belief that the National Labor Relations Board has authority under existing law to protect its own processes from abuses. A recent decision of the Supreme Court, however, has now finally ruled that under existing law the National Labor Relations Board is powerless to deal with the most flagrant abuses of the non-Communist affidavit. It

is to correct that imperfection that we introduce our bill. Our bill is not hastily drawn or conceived. It reflects more than 2 years of investigations, hearings, and study. Our final report lists 11 findings and recommendations. Our bill is designed to carry out one of those recommendations.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks the section of our subcommittee report which became Senate Document No. 26 of the 83d Congress, 1st session. I refer the Senate's attention specifically to our recommendation No. 5.

(See exhibit B.)

The enactment of our proposal is essential if the National Labor Relations Board is to be more than a filing cabinet of non-Communist affidavits under existing law. It has never been our feeling that the Board should be empowered to conduct wholesale investigations as to the validity of non-Communist affidavits. We agree with the framers of the National Labor Relations Act in this regard. The Board does not have the experience, the competence, or the personnel to carry out that function. This is the function of the Department of Justice. We believe, however, that where gross abuses of the affidavit processes exist the Board should be permitted to act and recognize the facts for what they are. Where a union officer refuses to say whether he signed the affidavit or refuses to reaffirm its validity, or has in fact been convicted of perjury in connection with the affidavit, it is clear the Board should have the power to declare that there has not been compliance with the act.

In other words, the union which is in question through the malfeasance of its officers is not to be permitted to have the benefits or the privileges prescribed under the Labor Management Relations Act.

It is important, however, that even if we recognize these facts and correct the inadequacy of existing law we guard lest we penalize innocent victims. We do not wish to penalize individual union members who could have had no way of knowing whether an affidavit was signed in good faith or not in the absence of a ruling from an appropriate body. Therefore, we propose that instead of immediately revoking compliance the Board be directed to notify the particular union that compliance will be revoked unless the union officer is unseated from his position within a 30-day period. This period of 30 days' notice is adequate in our judgment to safeguard the innocent from abuses.

Members of the Senate will recall that our subcommittee's recommendations urged more vigilant activity by the Department of Justice in connection with the non-Communist affidavit.

I digress for a moment to say that at the time we were holding hearings we quizzed the representatives of the Justice Department extensively as to what they were doing in the way of examining into the validity of non-Communist affidavits. I regret to say that at the time we were searching in this area we found that the Justice Department was doing very little. I assure the Senate that we informed the Justice Department, as a committee, and I, as chairman of the committee, that we expected very careful scrutiny of such affidavits. I am happy to report that as a result of those hearings and that interrogation, the Justice Department started looking into the validity of the so-called non-Communist affidavits, and there have been prosecutions following this change of policy.

We introduce our bill in the hope that it will close a loophole in existing law. We urge its favorable consideration by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The editorial and excerpt presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

#### EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Star of February 22, 1955]

#### UP TO CONGRESS

There is no doubt that Congress, in adopting the Communist affidavit provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, hoped to prevent Communist-dominated unions from using the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board. Consequently, the recent ruling by the court of appeals in the case of the International Fur and Leather Workers may come as a surprise to some people.

This union is headed by Ben Gold, convicted in April 1954 of filing a false affidavit in 1950 that he was not a Communist. In May 1954, after Gold had been reelected by the union despite his conviction, he submitted another non-Communist affidavit to the Labor Board. Because of the conviction, the Board rejected this 1954 application on the assumption that it, too, was false. It held that the union membership knew the affidavit was false, and concluded that, since the affidavit had been rejected, the union was not in compliance with the Taft-Hartley requirement that all officers must file such affidavits.

The appellate court, quite rightly, held that the Board had no authority to do this. The act provides for criminal prosecution of anyone who files a false affidavit, and Congress probably thought this would force Communist union officers to give up their posts. But the law does not provide for disqualifying a union because an officer files a false affidavit. If Congress wants to reach this result, it can do so by changing the law. But the Labor Board should not be permitted to take over the function of Congress in this respect.

#### EXHIBIT B

#### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Under this heading we want to set down some judgments about this problem which we believe are reasonably warranted by the facts.

1. Nobody has suggested to our subcommittee that our security machinery is not equipped to deal effectively with the protection of facilities and information in sensitive industries, from acts of sabotage or espionage; or at least as effective as it is humanly possible to be. The subcommittee did not have the resources to conduct an independent investigation of whether in fact the security agencies were taking all the precautions they could against Communist subversion. This matter should be fully studied and the facts made available to the Congress. Special attention should be paid by the Government in supervising its contractors and sub-contractors engaged in defense work to see that all appropriate safeguards against Communist infiltration are utilized.

2. One of the great assets, if not the greatest, which a democracy has in combating the threat of Communist penetration is an intelligent awareness of the threat and a desire to do something about it. No law, however intelligently framed, is a substitute for this asset.

We must in all candor recognize that an employer who sees rivalry between a Communist union and a non- or, indeed, anti-Communist union as simply ordinary trade-union competitiveness is lacking in the insight and perspective which we need to rely on so heavily.

We do not suggest, it should be made clear, that the employer favor one union as against another, or do anything else which would be contrary to law, when he is confronted with a rival union situation involving a Communist-controlled union and a non-Communist union. We do suggest, however, that an em-

ployer who takes advantage of such a situation to engage in decisive strategy is making no contribution to the common welfare.

The International Union of Electrical Workers (CIO) has charged that the General Electric Corp. has favored the United Electrical Workers (Independent) since expelled from the CIO on grounds of Communist domination. The General Electric Corp., speaking through Mr. Boulware, has vigorously denied this charge. We do not feel that we would be justified in making a definite finding on this issue in controversy, one way or the other.

We feel justified, however, in commenting on an attitude reflected in certain statements issued by the General Electric Corp. on the theme of a "Plague on both your houses" (hearings, p. 450 ff.). The essence of the theme is that there is little to choose from between leftwingers and rightwingers. The reference is to the UE and the IUE, respectively.

"We believe—the General Electric Corp. has said—they have in the end the same objectives. We believe that what each side advocates would result, in the long run, in substantially the same thing for our employees, our company, and our country." (Hearings, p. 451.)

This is an amazing statement and shows little comprehension of the forces at work in this world, in the year 1952. It is this attitude on the part of some employers which has made the opposition to the real Communists in the unions very difficult and explains in large part why the Communists have been able to retain as much as they have. If an employer says, in effect, there is no difference between a Communist union and an anti-Communist union, it is understandable why many workers may not pay too much attention to a valid charge that a union is Communist-controlled.

We need to recall Professor Seidman's critical differentiation between Communist unionism and other liberal or radical groups in the American labor movement.

"From the point of view of the other liberal or radical groups, a union is a primary institution that the group seeks to build and make strong, with the objective of winning benefits for the members and for workers in general.

"The policy of such unions is determined by an analysis of the needs of the workers who are employed in the industries in which those unions operate. Such other liberal or radical groups may be critical of employers, of the existing economic system, of Government policy; they may in a particular case be opposed to a war in which this Government is engaged, or even opposed to all wars; and yet I would sharply distinguish between such groups and the Communist Party on the ground that the Communist Party seeks control of unions not primarily to benefit the workers involved, but primarily because the unions then can be manipulated to further a party line which is in turn determined with reference to the interests of the U. S. S. R." (Hearings, p. 148).

Not to make this distinction, as apparently General Electric and other employers have not, is to play the Communist theme song, that an attack on Communists is an attack on all liberal ideas. We deny that it is impossible to distinguish between Communists and genuine supporters of liberal or orthodox ideas. The Communists are spokesmen for a conspiratorial system of power deriving its prime motivation from the needs of the U. S. S. R. We do not have to agree, necessarily, as many of us do not, with the program of free reform groups, to insist that the American tradition and constitutional system gives these groups every right to exist and to pursue every lawful means to propagate their ideas.

3. The issue which needs to be resolved is whether Communist-dominated unions pose



a sufficiently serious threat to our security to warrant Government action. We believe that Communist-dominated unions do pose such a threat, and the Government has taken effective steps to protect the national security against these threats. In this report we recommend additional steps that can be taken.

We do not accept the proposition urged upon us that a private group has an inherent immunity from public regulation on this point. This goes for both employers and unions. It happens that this committee has reported out legislation designed to end discrimination in employment based on race, color, creed, or national ancestry. If this legislation were passed no private group, employers, employment agencies, or unions would be permitted to carry on its activities in a way to run counter to the requirements of this policy.

The same principle applies to the question of Communist-dominated unions. The unions have no inherent immunity from regulation on this point. The decisive question is: Will this be a wise and democratic exercise of public authority?

4. The free labor movement must accept the responsibilities which go with its contention that it can handle the Communist problem in the unions on its own. Racketeering, discriminatory practices, exist in a few union situations. Where these unsavory practices exist they are breeding grounds for Communist penetration. They provide a cover for the real purposes of the Communists in the unions. The labor movement must decontaminate itself of these unhealthy influences.

The free unions have done more to isolate and destroy the staging points of Communist unionism than any other single force in American life. It is one thing to require a non-Communist oath as a condition of using the NLRB's facilities. But the critical anti-Communist pressure is exerted when the free unions expel Communist-dominated unions from their midst and then proceed to take their members away. This is anticommunism where it hurts the Communists the most. But, as we have seen, there are still pockets of Communist domination and the free unions must expend added power and resourcefulness in eliminating these Communist pockets.

We commend, too, the action which the American labor movement has taken to combat international communism. The fact that free labor movements all over the world are effectively fighting Communist aggression is in small part due to the economic and moral aid rendered by the American labor movement.

5. The National Labor Relations Board has authority under existing law (in its own words) "to protect its own processes from abuse." If it should develop that the Board does not have this authority, we urge that legislation be enacted to carry out the intent of this recommendation. We recommend that the NLRB in the exercise of such authority under existing law take judicial notice of three kinds of circumstances, as reflecting adversely on the good faith of an affiant of a non-Communist affidavit:

1. The refusal to testify under oath before a judicial body, grand jury, or legislative committee whether the non-Communist affidavit was signed by the affiant.

2. The refusal to testify under oath before a judicial body, grand jury, or legislative committee whether the affiant is a member of the Communist Party.

3. A conviction for false swearing in a non-Communist affidavit.

If the Board finds that there is a reasonable doubt as to the truth and validity of the affidavits, as a result of the failure to testify, or as a result of the conviction for false swearing as outlined above, it shall give the union in question 30 days within which to purge itself of the officers whose affidavits

have been found lacking in good faith. If the union submits proof that it has complied with the order of the Board it shall be considered as having remained in compliance with section 9 (h). If in the judgment of the Board the union has not purged itself of the officers whose affidavits have been found to be lacking in good faith, then the Board shall declare that the union is not in compliance with section 9 (h).

Our reasons for this recommendation are as follows:

(a) Whatever reservations we may have about the efficacy of section 9 (h), we ought not to embark on additional or more dubious legislation until we have exhausted the lawful remedies under existing legislation. With all of its one-sidedness, section 9 (h) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 has served to point up the issue and may, with appropriate implementation, yet help to identify the Communist-dominated unions. In our judgment, it should not be taken from the law until all Communist domination has disappeared from unions, at least in vital industries, or until, as implemented, it is proven ineffective and other preferable provisions are adopted.

(b) We believe that the NLRB can lawfully apply these recommendations without additional legislation. To be sure, as has been pointed out, Congress did not intend for the Board to conduct an independent investigation on the merits as to whether a particular 9 (h) affiant is or is not a Communist. What we are recommending here, and which in large part the Board has already done, is to protect its processes from obvious abuse. It is our judgment that the three types of circumstances cited above constitute obvious abuse and ought not to be tolerated without question.

(c) We are not insensitive to the implications which our recommendations have for the constitutional protection against self-incrimination. But, it seems to us that the constitutional protection ought not to become an immunity for Communist union officers from the consequences of bad faith in filing non-Communist affidavits. And in any case the loss suffered by such officers is a disqualification from serving as officers of a union which wishes to utilize the procedures of the law. That the unavailability of the Board's processes is something less than catastrophic is attested to by the fact that two large and powerful unions (and anti-Communist unions, by the way) have been able to exist for 5 years without access to NLRB procedures.

(d) The recommendation for a 30-day period of grace within which a union may remove the cloud of doubt prevailing with respect to 9 (h) compliance is motivated by a consideration that innocent victims of bad-faith filing ought not to be penalized for the acts of particular officers. All the members and non-Communist officers of the union could know, for sure, was that an affidavit was on file. They could not be expected to know beyond a reasonable doubt that the affidavit was executed in bad faith, in the absence of an authoritative declaration to that effect.

Therefore, to revoke compliance status retroactively would penalize union members and employers as well for acts over which they had no control. Legal logic may be on the side of retroactivity in this sort of situation but the facts of industrial relations are not.

A refusal of the union members to remove officers after their affidavits have been found defective in an authoritative determination by the NLRB puts the problem in a different posture. They can remove the officers or accept the consequences of non-compliance. But under our recommendation the alternatives are identifiable.

6. The Department of Justice should establish a special unit to deal with cases arising out of alleged violations of section

9 (h) with effective liaison relationships to the NLRB and the legislative committees engaged in Communist investigations.

7. To the extent necessary, the Munitions Board, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other agencies concerned with security problems should develop specialized competence in dealing with security implications of Communist-dominated unions. The Bureau of the Budget should undertake to study how the various Federal responsibilities in this field can be sensibly coordinated. The President, through the Bureau of the Budget, should also consider the development of in-service training programs for these various agencies on the goals and purposes of Communists in unions and how to distinguish the bona fide militant unionist from the Communist agent. It is a distinction which is not infrequently blurred, but as we have said, a very crucial distinction.

8. We do not believe that the National Labor Relations Board has the statutory authority or that Congress intended it to conduct an independent, de novo investigation of whether, in fact, an affiant is a Communist. Moreover, Mr. Herzog's analysis of this proposal we find very persuasive. Identifying Communists is a special form of expertise which the Board does not now have. Moreover, it would have the effect of delaying the processing of the cases of non-Communist unions.

9. We reserve judgment at this time on proposals that new agencies other than the NLRB be given authority to find Communist domination. The reasons for our reservations may be summarized as follows:

(a) The resources of Government agencies charged with security functions, strengthened as necessary, appear to be adequate at this time to deal with hazard of sabotage and espionage.

(b) The practical advantages of these proposals in removing the security hazard of Communist control are questionable if the time consumed by the Subversive Activities Control Board in its proceedings against the Communist Party, is any guide. The advantage of operating efficiency is on the side of the agencies like the FBI.

(c) The resultant penalties such as disestablishment of Communist unions would in part fall on the Communists but in greater part on the innocent victims, the union members, in the Communist unions who, it is clearly established, are overwhelmingly unsympathetic to the political aims of their leaders.

(d) This ideological testing of a union's right to survive is foreign to our tradition of a free labor movement.

If, however, our relationships with Soviet Russia deteriorate even further, these proposals should be reconsidered in the light of the new circumstances.

10. It is recommended that encouragement be given to unions to clean their own ranks of Communist influence by amending the law to permit a waiving of the affidavit requirement for those unions which incorporate a ban on the holding of office by Communists and enforce the ban in good faith. Such a provision would have the additional effect of cutting down the sizable clerical task of keeping track of thousands of affidavits.

11. The proposal that employers and their representatives be required to take non-Communist oaths as a condition for utilizing the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board has equity on its side to recommend it. The argument runs that union people will not resent the application of the affidavit requirement if they feel that they are not being singled out for special treatment as potential subversives. Measured against the standards of speed in processing cases, however, the advantage of this proposal seems to be dubious.

# REPORT ON DEPLETION OF SURFACE WATER SUPPLIES OF COLORADO WEST OF CONTINENTAL DIVIDE (S. DOC. NO. 23)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report on the depletion of surface water supplies of Colorado west of the Continental Divide, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF MARYLAND

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today the Free State of Maryland celebrates the 321st anniversary of its founding.

Three hundred and twenty-one years ago today two small ships anchored in the Potomac. Aboard were, in the words of Lord Baltimore, "20 gentlemen of very good fashion, and 300 laboring men well provided in all things." History does not record the number of women. Forced to wade ashore—the water was too shallow for the small boats of the *Ark* and the *Dove*—those on board the ships arrived in the promised land wet, bedraggled, and muddy.

But we are to be eternally grateful to those 320 weary men and their courageous women who dragged themselves ashore at St. Clements Island, for they created the spirit and the legal basis for the religious freedom now enjoyed by 160 million people of this country.

The group included both Catholics and Protestants, who had fled England and fought the wild Atlantic for almost 6 months to find a place in the New World where they could worship as they pleased. In the colony they established, a man was free to worship as his conscience dictated. This religious freedom under the Terria Mariae—Maryland—Charter granted to Lord Baltimore by King James was later to be written into the Constitution of this great Nation.

That was the Free State's first contribution to America, but it was only the beginning.

Maryland was 1 of the 7 colonies that took the first long step toward union 22 years before the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

On July 10, 1754, its delegates cast their votes for an American confederacy—the forerunner to our Constitution.

On the field of battle, the bravery and determination inherited from the founders by their sons may well have saved the Nation from destruction—not once, but twice.

The first occasion was at the Battle of Brooklyn. General Washington's army was facing a rout by the British, but a small battalion of Marylanders acting as a rear guard stanchly held off the Redcoats until General Washington could evacuate his troops and regroup them. Had they failed, it is almost certain that the colonists would have lost the Revolutionary War then and there.

The second was the famous defense of Baltimore against a 3-day amphibian attack in September 1814, in which the British were repulsed. An historian calls this "one of the most decisive battles of the modern world."

When a Marylander visits the church of his choice to worship, he can well feel a sense of thankfulness to the forbears who made it possible.

When he sees his flag, bearing the Calvert and Crossland arms quartered and the golden Bottony cross firmly affixed to the staff as required by the State constitution, he can well feel a sense of pride.

When a Marylander is cheered by the bright black and orange splendor of a Baltimore Oriole on the wing, or the pertness of a black-eyed Susan notifying him of the advent of spring, he can well feel a sense of happiness in the natural beauties of his State.

I am a Marylander. And I am thankful, proud, and happy to call the Free State my home.

## ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a very brief statement which I have prepared concerning the 134th anniversary of the independence of Greece.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

This week commemorates the 134th anniversary of the independence of Greece. Through the ages the people of Greece have stood as one of the finest examples of the determination of a free people to remain free. We in America, who cherish our own Independence Day, fully realize what independence means to a nation. Liberty—the determination of a free people to remain free, and union—the coordinated efforts of a people to stand strongly united behind their nation at all times—are two words of special significance to all freedom-loving and peace-loving nations of the world.

The people of Greece have together, in their firm stand against the tyranny of communism, not only inspired the free world but have encouraged us to look for growing resistance and revolt against international communism. The Greek people are practical idealists in the best sense. They know the realities we all face and are prepared to meet those realities with sound common sense. At the same time they are keeping glowingly alive, as they have always done, that spirit of freedom and of individual dignity without which existence is worth nothing at all.

We congratulate the Greek people upon this anniversary occasion. We look to them with admiration and high regard for the splendid example they have set us through the ages.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have also prepared a statement in connection with the 134th anniversary of Greek independence. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

On the 134th anniversary of Greek independence, I join with my fellow citizens of Greek descent in commemorating this memorable occasion.

The 25th of March 1821, is a day to be remembered by all freedom-loving people. On that day, 134 years ago, the Greek heritage of liberty took on added stature with the uprising of the Greek patriots against their Turkish rulers.

Greece remains one of our staunchest friends and allies. The people of Greece are passionately devoted to the cause of peace and freedom; they are true partners in the free world's battle against Soviet aggression.

The ties which bind the United States and Greece are based on enduring friendship and understanding. May they continue to grow ever stronger.

## TRAPPING OF SQUIRRELS AT THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have just been advised by the press that the White House has announced there will be no more trapping of squirrels on the White House grounds. However, the statement by Mr. Hagerty, the Secretary of the President, still leaves several questions unanswered.

One, Mr. President, is, Who ordered the trapping of the squirrels? Was it gremlins? I have just discovered that the District of Columbia code contains a provision regarding this matter, and I now read very briefly from the code of the District of Columbia:

No person shall at any time or at any place in the District of Columbia trap, catch, kill, injure, pursue, or attempt to trap, catch, kill, injure, or pursue any squirrel or any chipmunk, or shall shoot or hunt with a gun any rabbit or other wild animal without a special written permit to do so from such officer as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, by regulation or order, from time to time charged with that duty, under a penalty of \$5 or imprisonment in the workhouse for not more than 30 days, or both, for each squirrel or chipmunk trapped, caught, killed, injured, or pursued, or for each rabbit or other animal killed as aforesaid.

I cite the law only because I am concerned about the danger of the efficiency of the Executive Office being impaired by the unscheduled absence of any of its key personnel. Who may have to serve the 90 days in the workhouse for the 3 squirrels which, Mr. Hagerty confesses, have been trapped? And no mention was made of those squirrels which were pursued and not trapped. By admission of the Secretary of the President, the District of Columbia law was violated.

I should like to declare, in conclusion, that I am extremely gratified the White House has formally announced that the trapping of the animals, which have become a tradition and an institution on the White House lawn for over a century, is to cease.

I should also like to announce that all funds collected, and there have been funds collected from all over the country, will be given to the Wildlife Man-



agement Institute, an able organization which is devoted to the preservation of all animals, including squirrels, even squirrels on the White House lawn.

#### POSTAL PAY BILL OF 1955

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any morning business? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, is there to be a morning hour?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have already had a morning hour.

I have asked the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to offer his amendment at this time. After that is done, there may be an opportunity for the making of further insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated. It has already been printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 7, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out through line 24, on page 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 7. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of its enactment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the amendment I offer to the committee amendment is a very simple one and it will take me only a moment to explain it.

Instead of having the bill provide that the pay increase shall be retroactive, my amendment to the committee amendment provides that the increase shall not become effective until the first day of the first pay period after the date of enactment of the bill. For instance, as I understand, the pay periods are on the 1st and the 15th of each month.

Mr. President, I think it would be a very bad practice for us to make retroactive any pay bills which may be passed. A number of such bills will come before the Senate, one of which will relate to

the military service. In the military service there are now approximately 3 million persons. If that bill is made retroactive, of course, the other bills will follow the same line. I am advised by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that it will be nearly impossible to work out the details of a retroactive pay increase for the 3 million persons in the armed services.

My amendment to the committee amendment simply provides that, if the bill shall be enacted, the pay increases will not be effective on a retroactive basis, but, instead, will be effective on the first day of the first pay period following the enactment of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is controlled under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement.

What Senators are in control of the time on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia to the committee amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Virginia will control the time of the proponents, and that the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], will control the time of the opponents, inasmuch as I favor the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me ask whether there are Senators who desire to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to have 2 minutes to speak in opposition, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, although I control the time for the opposition to the amendment, I am actually in favor of the amendment. However, I shall yield time to Senators who may desire to oppose the amendment.

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is another side to the medal, in the case of the amendment the Senator from Virginia has offered. I think a great injustice was done at the last session of Congress, when the pay increase which was deserved was not accorded; and I believe that our failure to do justice then places upon us now the duty of going back and correcting that wrong.

Mr. President, I am not greatly moved by the statement about the auditing, bookkeeping, and accounting which will be necessary in order to do justice. The Senator from Virginia has spoken about a bad precedent. I also wish to speak about a bad precedent. I think it would be a rather bad precedent for us to take the position today that we are not going to right the wrongs which we ought to have corrected months ago.

Let us examine the record of months ago and read the remarks of some of the

Members of the Senate who realized that in the closing hours of that session the wrong which had been done was not going to be righted. It was argued that we could do it later, and that we could make it retroactive. Of course, all Senators who made that statement were speaking in the speculative and in the prospective; but that is the kind of argument which is made in the closing days of a session, when we wish to postpone action, by saying "We will do it at the next session, and then we will make it retroactive."

The time has come to make the increases retroactive. The Federal employees concerned have been wronged for a long enough time. We ought to correct the wrong now by making the increases retroactive to the time when we should have corrected the wrong in the first place.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we all know that pay rates of the Federal employees we are discussing at this time, namely, the postal employees, have not been increased since July 1, 1951. I invite the attention of the Senator from Virginia to the fact that when we passed that pay increase bill, in October 1951, we made it retroactive to July 1. So if we enact an increase at this time, 2 or 3 months after the first of the year, and make it retroactive to the first pay period after January 1, we shall be doing the same thing we did previously when we passed the pay act in October 1951.

The question is whether or not the Federal employees should have an increase in pay from January 1. That is the question which I think is before the Senate, and not the question as to whether or not it would cost the Government a little money to audit the books and arrange for the payment of these employees. The question is whether or not the Federal employees are entitled to a pay increase from January 1, 1955, as I see it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that at the time of the consideration of the bill the committee was very conscious of the precedent we might be setting, but that the reason why we entertained the idea of retroactive effectiveness of the bill was the fact that we voted the Federal employees a raise last year, and through no fault of theirs or ours, that raise was not granted?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. We took that fact into consideration, and we moved the date up to January 1, as of the time when the veto message was sent to Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. The original bill called for the increases to become effective as of the time of the veto of the bill we passed last year. Witnesses came before the committee and testified that it would

not throw everything out of gear if we started the pay increase at the first pay period after January 1. That is the evidence before the committee. We were told, "If you are going to make it retroactive, that date can be used without causing a great deal of trouble."

I ask Senators whether they think the Federal employees are entitled to a pay increase since January 1.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is there not a distinct difference between the Military Establishment and the employees whose compensation we are now discussing? They are not precisely in the same position. We did not vote any pay increase for military personnel, but we did for these employees. Through no fault of theirs, the increase was not granted. Therefore there is at least a moral obligation to make the pay increase retroactive with respect to these employees, because of the situation which I have mentioned.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator from Rhode Island is entirely correct. He has mentioned the Military Establishment. We find military personnel scattered all over the world. A great many more difficulties would be encountered in making retroactive a pay increase for military personnel than would be encountered in the case of postal workers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no further requests for time, I wonder if the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the minority leader will agree to yield back their time, so that we may have a vote on the pending amendment?

Mr. BYRD. I agree to yield back my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If there are no other speakers on this particular amendment, I agree to yield back my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment as reported. The substitute is Senate bill 1489, a bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire to have the substitute read in full, or printed in the RECORD?

Mr. CARLSON. I ask unanimous consent that it may be incorporated in the RECORD by reference, as a bill introduced by me on March 18, 1955.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas

to the committee amendment as amended.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement the time is limited to an hour and 30 minutes, one-half of that time to be controlled by the Senator from Kansas and the other half by the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas].

Mr. CARLSON. I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. President, I am offering, as a substitute for Senate bill No. 1 the text of Senate bill No. 1489.

I regret sincerely that I am unable to support Senate bill No. 1, which was reported by a majority of the members of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I think I have demonstrated my interest in behalf of our Federal employees, both from the standpoint of securing a substantial wage increase and fringe benefits, which are essential in modern-day employment.

I feel, however, that today we are confronted with a very realistic problem, and that the action taken by the Senate should be in accordance with the recommendations of the President in his message of January 11 to the Congress, in which he recommended legislation incorporating a modern and equitable salary plan for the postal service.

The President's proposal provides a substantial increase in the average wage of postal employees, along with a correction of serious inequities in the salary structure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's message of January 11, 1955, may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The Post Office Department, in its daily operations, affects the entire life of the Republic, from the family home to the great industry. A vast business-type enterprise within Government, the Post Office Department, consequently, requires a continuing vigilance that its methods, practices, and policies assure the most efficient possible service to the public. The measures recommended in this message are designed to that end.

Last August 23, in announcing my disapproval of H. R. 7774, an act to increase the rates of compensation of classified, postal, and other employees of the Government, and for other purposes, I expressed a purpose to continue to encourage the enactment of legislation to correct obvious distortions in the pay scales of the postal service and to provide for a more proper and effective relationship between pay and work performed.

I also pointed out the necessity of adequate postage rates in order to check a deficit in the operation of the Post Office Department which since World War II has reached the staggering total of more than \$4 billion.

An increase in the average wage of postal employees, along with correction of the serious inequities in the salary structure, is an essential step in bringing the wage scale into line with nongovernmental standards and in furthering the progressive personnel program to which the administration is committed. The increase must be accompanied by a salary plan which will place the wages for postal-service positions in proper relationship to each other so that inequities will be

eliminated, incentive for advancement offered, and the principle of higher pay for more difficult and responsible work followed.

In order to accomplish these objectives, the Postmaster General will submit to the Congress a new postal-salary plan along with a 5-percent increase in basic-salary rates. This plan will include reasonably detailed descriptions of the series of key positions to which the great majority of postal employees are assigned. A rate range for each of these positions will be recommended and, together, this series of rate ranges will make up a related, uniform, and equitable salary schedule.

The Congress will be asked to include the key-position descriptions and their appropriate salary ranges in the legislation, thus assigning specific wage rates to the bulk of the positions common to all offices of the postal service.

The Post Office Department should then be granted the authority to allocate the remaining positions held by the relatively few employees whose work is not covered by a key position to the proper level in the salary schedule on the basis of a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of these positions with the duties and responsibilities of the key positions.

In the allocation of the positions other than the key positions to the proper salary level an appeal procedure will be provided. Further, to insure that the salary plan will not work to the disadvantage of any employee, the legislation proposed will incorporate a guaranty against reduction of salary so long as the employee occupies the same or a position comparable to that which he held at the time of the installation of the plan.

This legislation would eliminate the inequities inherent in the present inflexible system which requires assignment of all employees to a limited number of job titles, in many cases having no relation to the work actually performed. The present practice of paying salaries to some employees on the basis of the number of cubic feet in the area they supervise, or solely in relation to the number of employees under their direction, would be replaced by a system requiring that salaries be based on the actual duties and responsibilities of the position.

Under this plan, postmasters of the Nation would receive salaries commensurate with the volume of work and the level of the responsibility of their offices rather than solely on the basis of cash receipts which presently govern their compensation. This practice results in discrimination against those holding offices where incoming mail represents most of the business volume.

The total cost of wage adjustments in the postal service is estimated at \$129 million a year. I recommend adoption of legislation incorporating these proposals.

The 83d Congress authorized appropriations to be made for the furnishing of uniforms or the payment of an annual allowance to employees, including those of the Post Office Department, required by law or regulation to wear a prescribed uniform while on official duty. This measure, when Congress makes funds available, will benefit post-office employees by an estimated \$13,500,000 a year.

I am recommending in another special message today a health-insurance plan to round out the Federal personnel benefits program enacted by the 83d Congress. This program already has provided group life insurance, unemployment compensation, elimination of restrictions on permanent promotions and reinstatements, adjustment of the statutory limit on the number of career employees, elimination of arbitrary restrictions on accumulation of annual leave, and a liberalized incentive awards system.

I wish to reaffirm my position that sound fiscal management requires consideration of revenues as well as costs. To this end, I am



requesting that Congress also consider legislation to adjust postal rates to provide needed revenue.

The combined postal deficits of the 156 years of our history as a nation, up to 1945, are far less than the losses sustained in the last 9 years. The anomaly of this situation is that the period which has witnessed this recordbreaking deficit in the operations of the postal service has also been a decade of unprecedented national prosperity. Employment, production, and use of the mails have been at an all-time high and yet postal deficits have occurred year after year. Clearly it is time to reaffirm the need for sound fiscal management of the Post Office Department and to develop a positive program toward this end.

In fiscal 1954 the Post Office Department received revenues of \$2,268 million for services performed at a cost of \$2,667 million, thus leaving a deficit of \$399 million in its operation. The services performed by the Post Office Department are of measurable value to the recipients. When the rates of postal services fail to provide sufficient revenues to meet the total cost of the service, the difference must be made up by general tax revenues.

A practice of this kind is neither equitable nor reasonable; it is neither good business nor good government. Even if a case could be made for regarding the postal patron and the taxpayer as one and the same, prudence and good sense would compel us to face the fact that it is far more efficient to collect the necessary revenues in direct exchange for services at the post-office window than by the more costly methods of general taxation.

The Post Office is constantly working to reduce the deficit by improving the efficiency of its operations. During the last 2 years substantial progress has been made in organization, mail handling, transportation, mechanization, recordkeeping, and accounting methods. The Postmaster General has also taken the initiative in increasing rates and fees within his jurisdiction.

As a result of these measures there has been a recent reversal of the postwar trend of ever-increasing postal deficits. These are the operating deficits for each of the last 5 years:

Fiscal year:	Operating deficit
1950.....	\$589,500,000
1951.....	551,500,000
1952.....	727,000,000
1953.....	618,800,000
1954.....	399,100,000

The large deficits in the postwar years are, in part, a direct consequence of the same inflationary increases in costs which all business operations have faced. Private business has increased prices of goods and services to offset increased costs of production. The Post Office operates in the same economic climate as private business. It must meet rising costs in very much the same way.

Since 1945, the largest part of the increase in postal expenditures is accounted for by salary increases legislated by Congress as follows:

Date	Public Law	Annual increase in cost to Post Office Department
July 1, 1945.....	134	\$178,767,000
Do.....	106	780,000
Jan. 1, 1946.....	381	190,631,000
July 1, 1946.....	390	684,000
Nov. 1, 1949.....	428 } 500 }	112,489,000
Do.....	429	278,000
July 1, 1951.....	204	248,600,000
July 8, 1951.....	201	1,100,000

These wage adjustments, combined with an expansion in the number of postal em-

ployees necessary to handle the greater volume of mail, have resulted in an increase in total salary costs from \$858 million in 1945 to \$2,002 million in the last fiscal year.

The increases in wages and other costs since the end of World War II have affected all classes of mail. It is desirable that the rates governing each class of mail be advanced in fair proportion. The committees of Congress responsible for postal-rate legislation will, of course, want to consider carefully the specific rates for each class of mail. The Postmaster General will soon submit to Congress, in addition to his views on increases in postal pay, detailed recommendations for raising postal rates to more reasonable levels. I wish to emphasize at this time a few of the major considerations which seem to me important in raising rates.

1. First-class mail has always provided by far the greater part of postal revenues. In 1933 the revenue contribution of first-class mail was more than 55 percent of total Post Office revenues. In the last fiscal year first-class mail provided only 40 percent of such revenues although the proportion of first-class volume to the total volume was only 3 percentage points lower than in the earlier year. The failure of this type mail to maintain its revenue contribution is a major factor in the present postal deficit. There is, therefore, an urgent need to increase the rate of postage of first-class mail.

Postal rates are payments made by users of the mails for services received. The rate established for each service should reflect the value of that service in terms of speed, priority of handling, and the privileges incorporated in each class of mail. If these factors are taken into consideration in rate-making, the revenue contribution of first-class mail is clearly inadequate.

The privacy, security, and swift dispatch of letter mail; the priority of service at all times, in all places; and the intrinsic value of such mail are factors which are pertinent to postal ratemaking in addition to the cost factor.

But the present 3-cent rate for first-class letter mail has not been increased in almost a quarter of a century. During this period the costs of all goods and services have almost doubled. I am convinced that the American people will understand, appreciate, respect, and support congressional action to provide for a long-overdue rate increase on letter mail which will go far toward balancing the postal budget.

2. The revenues derived from second-class mail are clearly inadequate. These rates which apply to newspapers and magazines should be increased until such matter makes a fair and reasonable contribution to postal revenues. The Postmaster General will recommend a two-step increase in second-class rates which will enable publishers to adjust more readily to the proposed rate changes.

3. Third-class mail consists largely of advertising matter. In fiscal year 1954 the revenue contribution of such mail fell substantially below the cost of providing service and was a major factor contributing to the postal deficit. The rates of postage on such matter should be increased so that the users of this class of mail pay a proportionately fair share of postal revenues.

In view of the recurring fiscal problems of the Post Office Department, and of the heavy burden which postal deficits continue to impose on the Federal Treasury, I strongly recommend to Congress the formal adoption of a policy which will insure that in the future the Post Office Department will be essentially self-supporting.

Certain services which are performed by the Post Office, such as those for the blind, are a part of general welfare services. The cost of such services should not be borne by users of the mails. Expenditures for them, and for services performed for the Government, should be identified and met by direct appropriation.

If the Post Office is successfully to meet the challenge of the future its prices must be sufficiently flexible to reflect changes in costs and the developing needs of a dynamic economy. It is my belief that an independent commission entrusted with the authority to establish and maintain fair and equitable postal rates can best provide this needed flexibility.

There are also other advantages. Such a commission, guided by policies laid down by the Congress, would have the time and facilities to make thorough analytical studies before prescribing rate changes. A commission well versed in the economics of modern pricing practices can continuously appraise and reappraise the soundness of the postal-rate structure. Legislation to secure these ends should be enacted by Congress.

With these views in mind I recommend to Congress the adoption of a temporary increase in postal rates as an interim measure, and the establishment and activation within the interim period of a permanent commission to prescribe future rate adjustments under broad policy guidance of Congress.

Let me reiterate—the financial problems of the postal service result, in large measure, from lack of a positive program leading toward a well-defined fiscal goal. I am, therefore, recommending to Congress the following 5-point program for the Post Office Department:

1. Approval of the new salary plan and a 5-percent increase in basic salary rates.
2. Adoption by Congress of the policy that henceforth the Post Office Department shall be self-supporting.
3. Separation of those postal costs to be paid by the patron from those costs which should be paid by general taxation.
4. Establishment by Congress of a permanent Commission authorized to prescribe postal-rate adjustments under policy guidance of Congress.
5. Enactment by Congress of an interim rate bill which will, pending activation of the Rate Commission, provide immediate revenue to meet proposed pay increases and reduce the postal deficit.

Approval of this program will be in the public interest for it will further assure efficient service by the Post Office Department.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 11, 1955.

#### POSTAL SALARIES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the salary plan proposed by the President in his January 11 message would place the wages for postal-service positions in proper relationship to each other, and would give effect to the principle of equal pay for equal work.

Senate bill 1489, which I offer as a substitute, embodies the essential features of the President's recommendations, and is identical with H. R. 4644, which was reported to the House by a bipartisan majority of 17 to 6 in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, except that the salary schedule for rural carriers is adjusted so as to maintain the present relationship with the salaries for city carriers. That is the only variation in the substitute.

The substitute provides a general increase in salary for all postal field service employees, averaging 7.6 percent. For example, the present salary range for letter carriers and clerks, who make up 300,000 of the 500,000 employees of the postal field service, is \$3,270 to \$4,070 per annum. Under Senate bill 1489, which I offer as a substitute for S. 1, the range would become \$3,640 to \$4,360 per annum.

It is estimated that the total annual cost of the salary increases provided by the substitute would be \$161,582,000.

#### POSTAL SALARY FACTS

Mr. President, I think we must keep certain facts in mind regarding postal employees and postal salaries. Prior to 1945 the range per annum was from \$1,700 to \$2,100. In 1951 the range was from \$3,270 to \$4,070. In other words, from 1945 to 1951 the annual basic salaries were increased from \$1,700 to \$3,270.

If my amendment is adopted, the basic salaries in 1955 will be increased from \$3,270 to \$3,640 and the range limit will be lifted from \$4,070 in 1951 to \$4,360. It seems to me that is a very substantial increase.

Postal employees enjoy some other benefits which I believe should be mentioned at this time. For instance, the employees of the Post Office Department have liberal vacations, ranging from a minimum of 13 working days for new employees to 26 days, or more than 5 weeks, for employees with 15 years or more of service. They have earned those benefits, but I believe it is important to keep that fact in mind when we consider pay classifications.

Postal employees also have 13 days of paid sick leave each year, which is cumulative if not used during the year. They have a 40-hour workweek. They have civil-service status and retirement benefits. Beginning this year, as a result of action taken at the last session of Congress, they will receive a tax-free uniform allowance of \$100.

It seems to me those facts should be taken into account.

#### COST-OF-LIVING COMPARISONS

Since 1945 the cost of living has advanced 48.6 percent. During the same period the starting salary for clerks and letter carriers has been increased by 92 percent, from \$1,700 in 1945 to \$3,270 at the present time. Senate bill 1489, my substitute, would increase the starting salary to \$3,640, or by 114 percent, as compared to 1945.

Since 1945 the top salary for clerks and carriers has increased by 94 percent, from \$2,100 to \$4,070. This does not include longevity payments of \$100 each at the end of 13, 18, and 25 years of service. Senate bill 1489, which I am offering as a substitute, would increase the top rate to \$4,360, or an increase of 108 percent, as compared to 1945.

The clerk or carrier working for the Department in 1945 at \$1,700 will earn \$4,360 upon passage of Senate bill 1489, an increase in basic salary of 156 percent.

#### ELIMINATES INEQUITIES

The substitute amendment establishes carefully developed schedules of compensation for each level of work, and these levels are interrelated so that employees who are performing duties which are similar or comparable from the standpoint of difficulty will be paid the same; those who are doing work of a higher level will be paid at commensurately higher rates. Thus, present serious inequities would be eliminated. No longer would some supervisor salaries be set on the sole basis of cubic feet supervised, or

number of employees supervised, but rather on the sound basis of duties and responsibilities.

The substitute contains 50 key position descriptions, to which 90 percent of the postal employees are assigned. The salary level for each key position is set forth in the substitute. The 50 key positions are assigned to the schedule in their ascending importance. Thus, the key position of janitor is in salary level 1, that of regional director is assigned to the top salary level 21.

#### APPEAL RIGHTS PROVIDED

The positions occupied by the relatively few employees who are not in one of the 50 key positions will be ranked by the Post Office Department in relation to the key positions, and placed in the proper salary level of the schedule by the Department. Appeal rights to the Civil Service Commission are provided for the employee who feels that his position has been assigned to the wrong salary level.

As an employee's duties change, or as new positions are created because of technological improvements in the movement of mail, the Department will be able to assign the position to its proper salary level, and pay the employee accordingly. Under present law, the Department has been limited by the job titles set forth in Public Law 134, and the pay rates established for those job titles.

In addition to the postal field service compensation schedule with its 21 salary levels, the substitute provides separate compensation schedules adapted to their conditions of service for rural carriers and postmasters of fourth-class offices. The schedule for fourth-class-office postmasters contains 8 categories of annual receipts, instead of the 17 now provided. This means that slight changes in cash receipts will not so readily change the postmaster's compensation.

#### ELIMINATES DISCRIMINATION

The substitute provides a seven-step range of pay rates for each employee, so that he may advance in pay each year until he reaches the top step for his range. Under present law, postmasters and supervisors are paid at single rates and may not advance in the same job; rank-and-file employees have varying ranges of steps or grades through which they automatically advance. There is no valid reason for this discrimination.

The substitute provides that when an employee is promoted to a position in a higher salary level, he will receive a substantial guaranteed increase, in contrast to the present system which frequently involves a token increase or no increase at all.

The substitute also permits an increase to \$9 in the present per diem allowance of \$6 for railway post office clerks while in travel status.

The substitute provides longevity increases for substitutes and hourly rate employees for the first time. This is particularly important to the many substitutes in third-class offices, whose opportunities for conversion to regular status are seriously limited.

The substitute relaxes the ratio of classified substitutes to regular employees from the present ratio of 1 classified

substitute for every 6 regulars to 1 for 5. This will permit the conversion of several thousand substitutes from indefinite or temporary tenure to career tenure.

#### BIWEEKLY PAY PERIODS

The substitute provides biweekly pay periods in place of the present semi-monthly pay periods. This will permit standardization of the payday so that it will occur on the same day of each alternate week throughout the year. It will also serve to give employees an extra day's pay during the year.

The substitute provides new promotion opportunities for postal employees, by the creation of salary levels which permit for the first time the recognition of more responsible duties.

The substitute contains safeguards to employees, in the form of appeal rights, prohibition of reduction of present salaries plus 6 percent, and protection of the employee's salary plus the 6 percent even if it exceeds the normal range for his position.

#### SUMMARY

In summary, the substitute:

First, Provides an average increase of 7.6 percent along with an equitable basis for compensating postal employees, not only in terms of their own job requirements but also in relation to the duties and compensation of all other postal employees.

Second, It establishes salary levels which are proper in relation to each other and in relation to the wage standards of nongovernmental enterprises.

Third, It provides a number of supplemental benefits to employees, such as the longevity increases for substitutes, and the biweekly pay period.

Fourth, It affords safeguards to employees so that no one may be injured by its provisions.

Fifth, The cost is estimated at \$161,582,000 a year.

And while removing present inequities, and preventing the introduction of new inequities, it also provides a pay structure which will encourage incentive for advancement and for improvement in the postal service.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will consider seriously the amendment I have offered. I have offered it in the hope, in fact, with the knowledge, that if it is adopted it will become law within a reasonable time and that the employees will receive an increase to which they are not only entitled, but which they should justly have. The action of the Congress will determine how soon they may receive that increase.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to corroborate at the very outset the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas. I believe no Member of the Senate has worked harder for the welfare of the employees than has the distinguished Senator from Kansas. But the question I should like to ask is this: Is not his amendment in the form of a substitute identical with H. R. 4644, which was repudiated by the House only last week?

Mr. CARLSON. Before answering the Senator's question, I wish to say that I



appreciate his very kind remarks concerning my work. It is a pleasure to work with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island on the committee. He has been very zealous in developing the proper base of compensation for postal employees. I know he and I have the same thought regarding the question.

My substitute is exactly the same as H. R. 4644, with one exception. That exception is with reference to the rural carriers of the Nation. They are granted the same step increase which was given the postal clerks in the House bill. Therefore, in my amendment the clerks and the rural carriers are all on the same basis.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator not agree that that is a very small part of the amendment?

Mr. CARLSON. I think it is rather important, if I may say so to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator has said that he has every confidence that if his substitute is passed it will be enacted into law. In view of the very large vote in opposition to the bill in the House, what disturbs me is how, from a practical point of view, the Senator can justify his very optimistic prediction. I am afraid that if we send the bill to the House amended as suggested by the Senator, the House will do precisely what it did last week to an identical bill.

Mr. CARLSON. It was my privilege to serve in the House of Representatives for 12 years. As the Senator knows, the occasion on which the House voted on H. R. 4644, the bill was considered under a suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds vote and places a limitation on debate of 20 minutes to a side. I have reasons to believe that many votes cast against the bill were cast against it because of the method by which it was brought before the House. Many Members wished to speak and to offer amendments. I think the vote in the House was not altogether based on the percentage points in either S. 1489 or in any other bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina such time as he may require.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate again some facts which I submitted yesterday.

Some features of the reclassification plan give me great concern, and also give a number of members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service much concern. I am reluctant to place in the hands of one man, however firm and competent he may be, the reins of control of persons who have career status in the postal service.

Please bear in mind that heretofore these employees have looked to Congress to see that they received just consideration in all matters affecting their work. If the Summerfield reclassification plan

should go into effect and be incorporated into law, all the safeguards which we have heretofore had will be out the window, and Mr. Summerfield will be allowed to reclassify employees as he may see fit.

I am hesitant to buy a sealed package. The Postmaster General does not tell us what he is going to do, but if we read the administration bill we shall see that everything is dumped into his hands. So far as I am concerned, what is going to take place in the future in this regard is a mystery.

Specifically, under the Summerfield reclassification plan, I have been unable to ascertain what will happen in a great many cases. For example, in many offices will the positions of assistant postmasters be abolished? I should like to have someone answer that question. If those positions should be abolished, would the assistant postmasters now holding the jobs be dismissed, after having served for 15, 20, or 30 years? Would the Senate no longer have the power to confirm the nominations of postmasters in third-class offices, because the receipts of the offices did not come up to a level to be set by someone in the Department? Under the substitute, the Postmaster General would be given the right to determine that.

So if Senators vote for the amendment, they will be turning over such appointments to the Postmaster General, lock, stock, and barrel.

I do not believe the problems which we are facing today should be solved in this manner. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, considering reclassification, held long hearings and decided what should be done.

Senators should also remember that if they give to the Postmaster General the right of reclassification and the handling of these other matters, they should not come back and complain about it in the future, for they will have given the Postmaster General that right.

Therefore, I plead with Senators to adopt S. 1 as reported by the committee after holding extended hearings. That bill does not change everything; it simply increases the salaries. It does not give to one class of postal employees preference over another. It does not give some employees as much as a 63-percent increase in pay, and others as little as a 2-percent increase. Oh, Mr. President, the word "average" is a very important one. When we hear about the "average" in the Summerfield bill, we are not told about some of the smaller salaries which would be affected very little. Neither are we told that the pay of some employees would be increased 60 percent or more. It is my purpose to give the facts as they are, and then to let Senators be the judges of what they want done in regard to the matter.

As I see it, the postal service employees are entitled to a 10-percent pay raise. This should not be a reclassification bill; and certainly not a bill giving to the Postmaster General the power of reclassification. That kind of proposal should be thoroughly investigated and reported upon by the committee, and not be acted upon ab initio on floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Would the Senator from South Carolina be interested to know precisely what would be the weekly increase in the salaries of 300,000 employees of the postal service, who constitute 66 percent of the entire personnel, as between a 7.6-percent increase, which we are told the President of the United States will endorse, and the 10-percent increase under S. 1, which is advocated by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it would be enlightening to the Senate to have such information.

Mr. PASTORE. The increase under Senate bill 1 would be only \$3.50 a week over that provided in the administration bill. If the point is being reached where the President of the United States will be irritated so much by an increase of \$3.50 a week to a faithful Federal employee that he will endorse one bill but will veto the other, then I fear we have reached a sad day in the Government.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to have the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

I have been receiving letters from various persons in regard to the situation. Although the postmasters of the United States endorsed the bill sponsored by the Postmaster General, I have found that some of them did not know what they were doing at the time they endorsed it. I have received a letter from the vice president of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, whose office is in Greensboro, N. C. This is what he has to say:

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: On behalf of the North Carolina postmasters, I want to thank you for the courageous stand you are taking relative to our legislation.

I have had very nice letters from Senator LANGER and Senator NEUBERGER relative to my stand on legislation. Why some of the Members of the House can't see the danger in H. R. 2987 is hard for me to see.

As our association endorsed the bill wholeheartedly, with the exception of my late opposition, I suppose we are to be blamed for not understanding the difficulties that could develop should H. R. 2987 be passed.

I hope that you and your committee will hold out for automatic promotion in all cases, rather than leaving it to the Department. It appears to me that there is enough classification in the amended S. 1 to satisfy everyone if they are fairminded about this whole matter.

There are a large number of postmasters and supervisors who would like to support your bill but are afraid of the consequences if they do.

Mr. President, there is much food for thought in that little sentence.

Hoping that I will have the opportunity of seeing you before so long, and with kindest regards and best wishes always,

Sincerely,

J. TRACY MOORE,  
Vice President.

Do Senators know that the Postmaster General even tells the Postmasters' Association whom to invite to their national conventions? If they want to invite someone who is not favorable to the

Postmaster General, he tells them not to invite that person. That is how he controls the Postmasters' Association. If anyone doubts that statement, I can verify the statement that he controls the association. I have read the letter of one person who is willing to state the facts and tell how he feels about conditions.

We are now considering an amendment which is sponsored by the Postmaster General. I, for one, wish to go on record as strongly as I possibly can against it, and to warn the Senate that if we pass at this time the bill desired by the Postmaster General—the administration bill, so to speak—we shall have trouble in the future. There will be those working in the Post Office Department throughout the United States—city carriers and rural carriers, especially—who will be dissatisfied with such legislation. They have gone so far as to testify before the committee in opposition to the amendment. Rather than to have the kind of legislation represented by the amendment, they would prefer not to have an increase in pay. That shows how fearful they are of the proposed legislation which is endorsed by the Postmaster General and is now offered as an amendment to S. 1, the bill reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator from South Carolina familiar with the fact that under the amendment in the nature of a substitute, individuals in certain positions ultimately, within perhaps a period of 7 years, would receive a \$4,900 increase, as against the weekly increase of \$3.50 for letter carriers, about which we are speaking?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. That is why I am against the amendment in the nature of a substitute. It is not equitable to the postal workers throughout the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter I received from Mr. Moore, dated March 7, 1955, which I just read; and I shall read a statement from Mr. Moore, dated March 16, 1955.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POST-  
MASTERS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Greensboro, N. C., March 7, 1955.

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: On behalf of the North Carolina postmasters I want to thank you for the courageous stand you are taking relative to our legislation.

I have had very nice letters from Senator LANGER and Senator NEUBERGER relative to my stand on legislation. Why some of the Members of the House can't see the danger in H. R. 2987 is hard for me to see.

As our association endorsed the bill wholeheartedly, with the exception of my late opposition, I suppose we are to be blamed for not understanding the difficulties that could develop should H. R. 2987 be passed.

I hope that you and your committee will hold out for automatic promotion in all cases, rather than leaving it to the Department. It appears to me that there is enough classification in the amended S. 1 to satisfy everyone if they are fair-minded about this whole matter.

There are a large number of postmasters and supervisors who would like to support your bill but are afraid of the consequences if they do.

Hoping that I will have the opportunity of seeing you before so long and with kindest personal regards and best wishes always,

Sincerely,

TRACY

J. Tracy Moore,  
Vice President.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I find that Mr. Moore wrote as follows in his statement to which I have just referred:

As National Vice President John Fixa, a candidate for national president of our organization, has thought it wise to bring to the attention of our members information relative to the endorsement of H. R. 2987, I wish to make the following statement: I have no criticism to make of any member of the executive committee who feels that he or she was qualified to pass upon legislation affecting vitally every postmaster in the United States. I attended every meeting and even though our January 27 Postmasters News Flash states, "In executive session now underway in Washington our national officers and executive committee members have given time and serious attention to a close analysis of its provisions" (H. R. 2987), no copy or draft of the 109-page document was available when the vote of endorsement was taken. We did later receive a copy of the bill as presented but if anyone present studied the bill, other than those who had previously assured us of its desirability, the fact is not known to me.

In reply to Mr. Fixa's statement that questions could have been asked, it would have been impossible to ask an intelligent question about a bill which one had not read and which was evidently not understood by those who stated they helped draft the bill and sent a flash to our membership whereby no mention was made of the controversial features, such as section 501, paragraph B, re advancement on the basis of superior performance; section 604, on page 15, of the March 1955 Tarheel Postmaster; section 605, dual employment; and section 802, assignment of employees for a period not to exceed 1 year. (It must be remembered, as shown on page 11 of the Tarheel Postmaster that employee includes postmasters and other personnel.) I have called this to the attention of the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committees and some of these items have been clarified or eliminated. If, as indicated in the last page of the February 11 NAPUS association News Flash, a second-class postmaster will not necessarily be in level 8, there is sufficient leeway in this bill for the Department to make different levels and steps applicable to postmasters or supervisors than appear applicable in the bill.

If that be so, if a Senator were a supervisor or postmaster, would he not be almost afraid to open his mouth?

I continue to read from the statement:

If H. R. 4644 is fair to all postmasters, what explanation is there that a postmaster, with no employees under his supervision, with receipts of \$1,500 will get \$4,630 at the end of the seventh step while the postmaster under the same bill with \$1,499 in receipts will get \$3,018, a difference of \$1,612?

A second-class postmaster with \$8,000 receipts and one with \$39,999.99 would both

receive the same salary, \$5,910, at the end of the seventh step which would not appear to be "equal pay for equal responsibility." If H. R. 4644 is so written that this is not the case, it is subject to great variance in interpretation and no postmaster could know which of the several factors specified in the key positions was responsible for the salary he would receive. Amended S. 1 would not be subject to various interpretations.

A representative of the NAPUS, in testifying before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives on February 2, made the following statement: "Section 403 of H. R. 2987 not only guarantees that every fourth-class postmaster shall have an immediate 5-percent increase over his present salary, but that he will enjoy the same seven-step increases provided for postmasters of the larger class offices." This has been confusing to some postmasters as the number of steps of fourth-class postmasters ranges from 2 to 7.

If such a complete study of the bill was made by all responsible, why did the association, on the last page of the February 11 Flash state that "postmasters in level 10 or above will advance in the same manner to step 5," when the facts are they would advance into only step 4. Beyond this, the advance will only be made upon superior performance.

And who decides that? The postmasters do.

I continue with the statement:

In the fourth paragraph of Mr. John Fixa's letter, the following quotation is given verbatim:

"As one of your elected representatives to the national office, I am morally obliged to abide by the decision of the majority which it sincerely believes will accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number. Furthermore, it is a fundamental principle of parliamentary procedure, amply supported by legal precedent, that a majority decision is binding upon all and each is honorbound to abide by it. To do otherwise is to invite chaos, confusion, and misunderstanding. Evidence thereof is indicated in the March 1955 issue of North Carolina's Tarheel Postmaster which gives a partial schedule of salaries for fourth-class postmasters in the provisions of H. R. 2987 as originally proposed."

The schedule Mr. Fixa enclosed is most interesting as fourth-class postmasters now receiving \$1,128, \$1,327, and \$1,441 will all receive at the seventh step \$1,761, which further shows that fourth-class postmasters will receive from 10.2 to 54.2 percent increase, the highest increase in the lowest grade which is rapidly being eliminated.

Upon having my attention drawn to what were considered inequities in H. R. 2987, a long-distance call was made to our national president, Raymond V. McNamara, who had labored long and hard in trying to get a satisfactory bill, and I was told that he was unable to effect changes in the matters I considered possible of misinterpretation or that could be used to the detriment of postmasters, in effect weakening the civil-service law, of which we are so proud.

It was regretted, as stated, that it was necessary, in my opinion, to fulfill my obligation to those whose trust and confidence caused my election, to point out to those responsible for recommending this legislation to the Houses of Congress these inequities. As a past member of my State general assembly, I have had some experience in parliamentary law. In answer to Mr. Fixa's statement, it is a well-known fact that when one has voted while under a misapprehension, a correction is in order, and no one can truthfully state that these inequities were brought to the attention of the executive committee.



To all those who feel that the decisions made by the executive committee were then and still are in the best interest of all concerned, I have no fault to find. In a democratic organization it is certainly the privilege of any individual or officer to express his individual opinion, officially or otherwise, and I have asked no member of the executive committee to change his stand but I feel that they are entitled to know my reason for the position that was taken. Many postmasters have written expressing the thought that more beneficial legislation will be the eventual result by a freer discussion of the pros and cons of the legislation considered at this time. As a candidate for national president, I realized that my action would not be popular with some sources. I grant that there are those who would have reason to prefer H. R. 2987 or the amended bill, H. R. 4644, to the amended S. 1, which as yet has not been shown to be unfair to any postal personnel.

All postmasters, except fourth-class postmasters, under the amended S. 1 will receive a minimum of \$400 upon the effective date and \$100 annually for 6 years, giving all these postmasters and supervisors at least \$600 more than other employees at the end of the 6 years. This should be classification enough for the satisfaction of all those feeling a difference between employees, supervisors, and postmasters is needed.

This is written for publication in the Tarheel Postmaster as the North Carolina chapter, through its executive committee, unanimously endorsed S. 1 and is entitled to this information. All members of the executive committee and all State presidents, secretaries, and editors are on the Tarheel Postmaster mailing list.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that only postmasters have been mentioned. What about the salaries of clerks and mail handlers?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am trying to illustrate that the increases in salaries of such employees will be a meager amount.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, 4 or 5 years ago mail handlers at the bottom of the list were receiving a salary of \$1,950. Veterans who had wives and children were supposed to live on a salary of \$1,950. Congress raised the salaries for such employees about \$400, with a provision that if the employees worked hard, they would get a \$100 increment every year.

Does not the Senator think it is unfair to consider the percentage of proposed increases for mail handlers in view of the very low salaries such employees were getting about 5 years ago?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator is entirely correct, especially when the increases in living costs are considered. Everyone has to eat, and sometimes the man receiving the lowest salary works harder and has to eat a little more than others.

Mr. LANGER. I believe the distinguished Senator was present at the time there was a hearing at which were pres-

ent witnesses who testified that wives of some of the letter carriers had made their dresses out of uniforms which letter carriers had discarded. The letter carriers could not use the uniforms, because they were so worn and dilapidated, so the wives made dresses for themselves and clothes for their children out of them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I remember that incident. I think the Senator was a member of the committee at that time.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not also true that at that time it was shown that a very large percentage of the clerks, letter carriers, and mail handlers, and some of the other postal employees received such low salaries that in many cases their wives had to take jobs, too?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LANGER. And that as a result, there was delinquency among the children? Is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LANGER. And that some of the men had to take two jobs?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is also true in some instances.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true at the present time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps some of them have to drive cabs at night, in order to make both ends meet. Is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes. Furthermore, when they work such long hours, they come to work for the Government half worn out, already, and probably cannot give the kind of service they normally would give if they were paid decent wages and could devote their working hours to the Government, instead of working on the outside, as well.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not also true that when the Langer-Chavez retirement bill was passed, Congress barred from the provisions of that measure all the widows—some 5,000, who were receiving only \$50 a month—and the act never was made retroactive, and even today those 5,000 widows are trying to get along on \$50 a month?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LANGER. Has not the distinguished Senator from South Carolina introduced a bill—a measure which I, together with other Senators, have had the pleasure of cosponsoring—in an effort to take care of the 5,000 widows who today are almost starving, because they are trying to live on \$50 a month?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LANGER. At the hearings, did not witness after witness testify that letter carriers, mail clerks, and other postal employees did not have enough money properly to educate their children?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes. In some instances it was brought out that they did not have enough money to educate their children—especially not enough money to send their children to

college; and in some instances they had to take their children out of high school, and put them to work.

Mr. LANGER. We found instances, did we not, especially in the case of larger families, where boys 16 years of age had to be taken out of school, and put to work, in order to support the family?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me add that the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has done yeoman service in connection with this matter; and I think he understands it as well as does any other Member of the Senate. So let me ask him a further question, if he will yield further: Even if the 10-percent-pay-increase bill is enacted, will the take-home pay, as we discussed it yesterday, be equal to the take-home pay these Government employees received in 1939?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The take-home pay will still be less than what they received in 1939. Furthermore, we must also take into consideration the increase in the cost of living.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield briefly to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to inquire how much time remains to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has 24 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from South Carolina desire to take additional time now?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to have about 3 more minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I yield 3 more minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes more.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the chairman of the committee inform me when the last pay raise was given the postal workers?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. On July 1, 1951.

Mr. LEHMAN. That was about 4 years ago, was it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes. Of course, the Senate already today has voted not to make the proposed pay increase retroactive. But in 1951, the pay increase bill was passed in October, as I recall; and we made it retroactive to July 1.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was very sorry that the Senate this morning voted down the provision of the pending bill which would have made this pay increase retroactive.

Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for several other questions?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It has been approximately 4 years since the last pay increase was given the postal workers. Does the Senator from South Carolina know of many industries, or, in fact, of any industry in the country whose workers have not received some pay increase during the past 4 years?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can truthfully say that I am not aware of any corporation in the United States that has not granted a pay increase to its employees during that period of time. Of course, there may be some corporations that have not granted pay increases in that period of time; I am not acquainted with all United States corporations; but I do not know of any that have not granted an increase in that period.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know of any, either.

Let me say that I have, of course, not analyzed the technical features of the bill as closely as the members of the committee have; but I understand that the beginning pay for truck drivers would be \$3,590, in the postal service.

I wonder whether the Senator from South Carolina is familiar with a table prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which shows that whereas the starting salary of postal truck drivers is \$3,590, the average salary of truck drivers in New York City is \$4,118; in Cleveland, \$4,243; and in San Francisco, \$4,472. I know of no class of people who work harder than the postal employees do, or are more deserving of adequate pay.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time allotted the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Is there further yielding of time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from South Carolina desire to have me yield him additional time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, if the Senator from New York wishes to ask me further questions.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I should like to continue my questions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes more.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield further to me, let me say I know of no class of workers who work harder than do the postal employees. Yet, as a result of the proposed substitute bill, very wide discrepancies would appear. I believe that all categories of the postal workers are entitled to a 10-percent pay raise, and I shall strongly support that view and gladly vote for S. 1. It is in my opinion a fair and equitable bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from New York make that statement. The position he takes on that

matter is also my position, and of course it was the position of the committee.

We thought that our bill, which is easily understood—it provides for a 10-percent increase straight across the board—should be passed, rather than a bill calling for a 63-percent increase for some employees, a measly 7 percent or less for other employees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What was the amount of the increase in 1951?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not have the figure before me; but so far as I recall, it was approximately 8 percent. I believe that is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. If a motion is made to lay on the table the amendment in the nature of a substitute, will the Senator who makes the motion be entitled to 45 minutes?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to serve notice now that at the proper time I shall move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the committee amendment was agreed to. When the vote on that amendment was taken and the amendment was agreed to, I was absent from the floor; and I wish to move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Byrd amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President—

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Rhode Island wish to speak at this time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I would not wish to impose on the Senator from Kansas by speaking on his time against his amendment. I would prefer to have time yielded to me by the chairman of the committee, unless the Senator from Kansas has ample time to spare.

Mr. CARLSON. Inasmuch as 1 hour is available on the bill, even though that time might ordinarily be used immediately preceding the vote on the question of final passage, I suppose some of that time could be used now, if that would be agreeable to both sides. I should like to keep the time available to me, if the Senator from Rhode Island will permit me to do so.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. At this time, what Senators are in charge of the time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] are in charge of the time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in view of the time limitation, perhaps it will be agreeable to the Senator from Rhode Island to permit the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to speak at this time.

Mr. PASTORE. Very well.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion during the preceding debate concerning the power of the Postmaster General under the reclassification features of Senate bill 1489. I think there are some facts which should be placed in the Record.

Under Senate bill 1489, 92 percent of the jobs in the Post Office Department, or 456,365 of the 500,000 employees, would fall in the set levels of this bill which legislatively establish their job status. That leaves 8 percent yet to be determined which level they are to be placed.

It has been stated, with respect to these particular positions, that the Postmaster General has too much authority to grade these jobs. I should like to call attention to some amendments which have been placed in this bill to limit such authority. I will say, frankly, that I would insist on such amendments in the bill.

Section 202 of the bill authorizes an employee to appeal to the Civil Service Commission from any action taken by the Post Office Department in the assignment of a job to a key position or to a salary level. It also makes the decision of the Civil Service Commission mandatory on the Postmaster General. In other words, the Department could not in any way override the decision of the Civil Service Commission once the employee, feeling that he had been unfairly or unjustly treated, had made his appeal and the Commission had rendered a decision. It seems to me that is one thing which really protects the employee. Section 201 deals with that particular subject.

There are many other provisions in the bill. In fact, 20 amendments were offered to tighten it. Sections 201, 202, 203, 301, 302, 303, and 504 of H. R. 4644 would establish by law the grade and salary of more than 90 percent of the positions, and provide a mandatory procedure for establishing the salary level of all others. All these provisions are tightened as much as possible in this bill.

It has been mentioned that the increases are not in the 6-, 7-, or 8-percent bracket for some employees. Based upon a statement which has been submitted to me by the Post Office Department, the minimum increase for any one particular section or group in Senate bill 1489 is 6.1 percent, and that is for post-office supervisors. Clerks and mail handlers in second-class offices would receive 8 percent; clerks in third-class offices would receive 9.4 percent;



city carriers would receive 8.2 percent, and so on down the list. The average is 7.6 percent.

I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have been referring may

be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Analysis of estimated additional annual cost of postal field salary bill, H. R. 4644<sup>1</sup>*

Account	Base increase	Percent increase	Conversion to schedule	Percent increase	Total annual cost	Percent increase
Post office inspectors.....	\$400,200	6.0	\$186,000	2.8	\$586,200	8.8
Clerks, inspection service.....	113,400	5.9	37,100	2.0	150,500	7.9
Postmasters.....	8,197,800	6.0	2,033,700	1.5	10,231,500	7.4
Post office supervisors.....	6,495,100	5.8	317,500	.3	6,812,600	6.1
Clerks and mail handlers, 1st- and 2d-class offices.....	45,553,000	5.9	16,246,100	2.1	61,799,100	8.0
Clerks, 3d-class offices.....	1,793,000	6.0	1,038,900	3.4	2,831,900	9.4
City carriers.....	30,134,500	5.9	11,579,100	2.3	41,713,600	8.2
Special delivery messengers.....	1,242,500	5.9	69,900	.3	1,312,400	6.3
Rural carriers.....	8,818,500	5.9	481,500	.3	9,300,000	6.2
Custodial service.....	3,358,700	5.9	541,300	1.0	3,900,000	6.9
Postal transportation service.....	10,226,500	5.9	1,473,500	.9	11,700,000	6.8
Stamped envelope agency.....	1,600	5.7	400	1.4	2,000	7.1
Vehicle service.....	1,964,900	6.0	415,100	1.3	2,380,000	7.3
Mechanicians and examiners.....	7,400	5.6	3,800	2.9	11,200	8.5
Equipment shops.....	49,200	6.5	1,800	.2	51,000	6.7
Total conversion cost for Public Law 134 employees.....	118,356,300	5.9	24,425,700	1.7	152,782,000	7.6
Regional employees (Classification Act).....					1,000,000	7.5
Longevity increases for substitutes.....					1,000,000	
Substitute rural carriers pay on 312-day basis.....					2,000,000	
Total increase for personal services.....					156,782,000	7.8
Increase in travel cost for postal transportation service employees.....					3,600,000	
Total.....					160,382,000	

<sup>1</sup> Percentage increases are based on estimated salary costs, fiscal year 1955, including overtime, nightwork differential, terminal leave payments, and territorial cost of living allowances and longevity.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I think we need reclassification in the Post Office Department. Public Law 134, under which the Department has been operating for many years, has been amended and supplemented more than 160 times. We have passed pay bills with a minimum standard of \$400, \$300, and \$200, and I have participated in securing their approval. But I think the time has come—in fact, I think it is past due—to write reclassification legislation which will bring about some order and system in the Post Office Department, in the interest of the employees. There may be some provisions of the particular bill which I have offered as an amendment which involves reclassification features. It may be that further study will indicate that certain changes should be made. I do not know of any. But if and when the bill goes to conference, if there are such items, I shall be the first to make every effort to correct them.

Mr. President, this is a step in building a modern post-office service. I want Members of the Senate to know that in my firm opinion the legislation proposed by amendment should be supported, and that the amendment should not be rejected merely because someone says there are a great many "bugs" in it, and that it is not workable. I believe it is. I believe it is necessary, and I sincerely hope the Senate will adopt this amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I intend to vote

for Senate bill 1. I shall vote for Senate bill 1 because it provides for a 10-percent increase across the board, with a floor of \$400 in the event that the 10-percent increase does not equal \$400 in certain categories. I feel that a 10-percent increase at this time is equitable, and that it is a fair solution of the problem of pay increases for the faithful employees of the Post Office Department.

The last time we gave heed to this great problem was almost 4 years ago. At that time, as most Senators will recall, we went through very much the same situation we are going through now. We were told time and time again, statistically, how much money the proposed increase would cost the American taxpayers, although at the same time, and in the same session, we were giving away billions of dollars to people all over the world without blinking an eyelash.

Now we are being told that the reason why the President would veto the committee bill, if it were enacted into law, is that it would cost \$50 million more than would the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Inasmuch as we are getting into the field of statistics, perhaps it would be well to recite some of the statistics which are involved in both these proposals.

If Senate bill 1 is enacted, the clerks and carriers of the Postal Department in the first grade will receive an annual increase of \$430. If the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is adopted, they will receive \$370 a year, which is a difference of \$60. We are told on the floor of the Senate that if we give carriers in the first grade an increase of \$60 more than is proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Kansas, the President of the United States will veto the bill.

Sixty dollars a year is about \$1.50 a week. So, a dollar and a half a week is going to irritate the White House to the extent that the bill will be vetoed.

Let us go from grade 1 to grade 2. Under the terms of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, employees in grade 2 would receive an increase of \$270 a year, whereas under Senate bill 1, they would receive \$430, or a difference of \$160. We are being told that if we pass Senate bill 1, it will be vetoed, but that if we pass the bill in the form proposed by the Senator from Kansas, it will be approved by the White House. In the second example I have used, the difference would be \$3 a week.

I realize that the budget is not balanced. I realize that no matter which of the two solutions the Senate adopts today, the budget will still be out of balance, not by millions of dollars but by billions of dollars. Whether we pass one proposal or the other, we shall still be handing out billions of dollars to people all over the world. Yet we are being told that we are so poor that we cannot give a letter carrier an increase in his compensation of \$1.50 a week. If that is justifiable irritation, if that is justification for a veto, then I say we are wasting our time arguing one way or another on the proposed legislation.

We have gone through this argument time and time again. Last year we were told we could not afford a 5-percent increase unless we made the 3-cent stamp into a 4-cent stamp. We were told on this floor that if we did not raise the postal rate, we could not raise the salary of a letter carrier. I did not think those who said it meant it, but it seems they did mean it, for the bill was vetoed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.  
Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that in the field of classified employees, who were not affected by the postal rates, the bill for the classified workers was also vetoed?

Mr. PASTORE. Certainly. That shows how fallacious was their logic. They told us if we did not raise the price of a stamp, we could not increase the salary of a stenographer in a department of the Government not at all connected with the Post Office Department.

As Senators know, the argument which was made was that we could not afford it. Every time we talk about raising the salaries of Federal employees, we are told the Government cannot afford to raise them. Yet the same persons who make that argument tell us that we must be very generous in giving the money of American taxpayers to people all over the world.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to mutual assistance. I am not opposed to the Marshall plan; I am not opposed to foreign aid; but at the same time I am in favor of domestic aid. I am for the Federal employees, too. I am for the letter carriers, who make only a meager salary. In many instances their wives have to go to work in order to keep their families together. I have not seen a letter carrier riding around in a Cadillac.

Most of the letter carriers buy bread with their money. They buy food for their families. They try to send their children to college. I say to the Members of the Senate that unless we take measures to raise the wages of these employees and improve their morale, I am afraid we are going to demoralize the entire governmental structure.

What is involved here is a small amount. I realize that when we talk about millions of dollars it sounds like a great deal of money. However, we are talking also about a half million people. There are almost 500,000 men and women who work for the Post Office Department.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that out of any raise we give them approximately 20 percent or 25 percent will be deducted each month or every 2 weeks for income taxes?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think there is an exemption given to anyone so far as income taxes are concerned, under either the amendment or the bill itself. Of course they will pay taxes, just as everybody else pays taxes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that whatever increase the postal employees receive, the money will be put back into circulation, because they will buy bread and clothes and the necessities of life? In that way the money will be put back into circulation. That means that the money will turn over. That in itself will help to bring in additional income to the United States. Is that not correct?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

I wish to make one more argument before I take my seat. We are told in one breath we cannot afford to give the postal employees the increase provided by the committee bill. In the next breath we are told that in the schedule listed in the substitute amendment there are certain categories in which the pay raise, in a period of 6 years, will go up almost \$5,000.

After all, Mr. President, about whom are we concerned? We are concerned with the little people. Every time we talk about a pay raise for these poor people, we are given a lot of statistics. Mr. President, let us forget statistics when we deal with human beings. We are dealing with governmental employees, who do not make a great deal of money.

Whatever form the increase takes it will not break the American bank. Between the bill and the substitute there may be a difference of \$50 million one way or another. However, let us remember that in the Senate we have been getting into the habit of talking in terms of billions of dollars. I say to the Members of the Senate it is regrettable that \$1.50 a week, or \$3 a week, should constitute the difference between approving a piece of legislation and vetoing.

I tell Senators frankly that 10 percent is a fair amount. This bill should not be compromised on the floor of the Senate. We must go to conference with it.

The House of Representatives has already rejected by a vote of 302 to 120 a bill which provided specifically and precisely what is provided in the amendment in the form of a substitute.

If we must compromise the bill, I say to the Members of the Senate that we should first pass S. 1. Let us get it into conference, and let us give the postal employees a raise before it is too late.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has made a very impassioned plea. It is a plea with which I should like very much to go along. However, I want to say that the vote we will cast today will not be a vote merely to increase the salaries of our postal workers. If we vote a 10-percent increase for postal workers, it will amount to a total of \$220 million. If we do that, we will also have to provide—and we should—a 10-percent increase for classified workers, and that will aggregate \$500 million. We will also have to vote an increase in salary for all those in the Military Establishment—and we should of course if we raise all other Government salaries—and that will total over a billion dollars.

Therefore, \$1,750,000,000 is involved in the action the Senate takes today. It is not merely \$40 million or \$50 million, as the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has stated.

So, Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will consider seriously the position of the President of the United States. He has an obligation and a duty in connection with this matter. It is up to him to preserve and protect and keep strong and sound the fiscal position and policies of the United States. He has so stated. He came to Congress with a message. He wants to give the workers of the Government—postal, classified, and military—an increase in pay. He wants to give them a fair increase in pay. He is willing to accede to a 7.6-percent increase for the postal group.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I shall yield later. Here we are about to vote a 10-percent pay increase for the postal workers. I cannot see how the President can do anything but veto a bill providing such an increase. If we vote a 10-percent increase for postal workers, it is obvious that we will vote a 10-percent increase for classified workers and a 10-percent increase for those in the Military Establishment.

I say very honestly that I have not discussed the 7.6-percent proposal with the President, but I have every assurance that he will sign a bill carrying a 7.6-percent increase. When he does so, the postal workers can have a salary increase next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes. When the President signs such a bill, the postal employees will have an increase in salary, the classified workers will have their increase in salary, and those serving in the military forces will have an increase in salary.

Why are we not practical in this body, instead of trying to engage in shadow-boxing about what we would like to have? I, too, would like to have what the Senator from Rhode Island wants to have. However, I want our Federal workers to have a pay increase.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator from Kansas deny the fact that ultimately the bill the Senate passes will have to go to conference? Will the Senator from Kansas deny that originally, when the President suggested an increase of 5 percent across the board, we were told that if we made it in excess of that amount the President would veto the bill? After some more thought the White House raised the amount to 7.6 percent. Who knows, by the time we get to conference the President may be willing to go along with 9 percent. If he is, I will accept it. That will be satisfactory to me. However, unless we pass a bill that will give us an opportunity to discuss the matter in conference, I am afraid we may end up without a bill.

Mr. CARLSON. I participated in securing an added increase of 1 percent. The bill I introduced originally carried an increase of 6 percent. I had considerable discussion with the executive branch of the Government looking toward getting the 1-percent increase. In other words I have already secured an additional \$20 million through considerable effort and suasion. I know positively that we cannot increase it any more without running into difficulty.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Under Senate bill 1, everyone knows exactly what a postmaster's increase in salary will be. Is not that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Can the Senator give me the name of one postmaster in the United States and tell me what his salary would be if his amendment should be adopted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

There are standards established which provide specific salaries. There should be no difficulty about that; there will be no problem.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Where in the Senator's amendment are they to be found?

Mr. CARLSON. They are in the amendment; there is no question about it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. A second-class postmaster at the present time is paid \$4,770. Under Senate bill 1 we know what his salary will be. Under the administration bill, what will his salary be? I am objecting because we are asked to vote for a "pig in a poke," so to speak, and I should like to know what I am voting for.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is more familiar with the subject than I am. The



receipts of a post office must be considered before the salary of any particular postmaster can be determined. My time is running out. The amendment is specific.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No amendment is in order until the time has expired. The Senate is operating under extremely limited time. Does any Senator in control of the time yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, all I wish to do is to submit an amendment to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. My amendment is to strike out all of section 710, beginning on line 11, page 109, and extending down to line 15, on page 110, and to insert the following:

The provisions of this bill shall take effect on September 1, 1954.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator cannot offer the amendment until the time has expired.

Mr. LANGER. I have offered it at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is out of order.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas has 7 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, S. 1 makes no provision for reclassification in the postal field service. For that reason, to my mind, it is an inadequate piece of legislation. Last year the President vetoed a postal salary bill which failed to provide for reclassification.

The original bill introduced by the Senator from Kansas and several colleagues, S. 773, provided for reclassification of the postal field service. I know the Senator from Kansas had in mind that S. 773 contained provisions which might require revision so far as reclassification was concerned, and I know he welcomed, as we all welcomed, the House committee's action in making such revisions. In Senate bill 1489, which the Senator from Kansas has offered as a substitute, provisions for reclassification thus modified are included.

The latter bill also provides for an across-the-board salary increase of 6 percent, and, with the reclassification provisions, it gives an average increase in the postal field service of approximately 7.6 percent. It seems to me it would be reasonable to increase it by, roughly, one more percentage point, selectively applied. I understand, however, it is the administration's firm position that the rate should not be increased. I understand its position to be very firm.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall not, as I had once intended to, offer an

amendment to raise certain of the rates provided by the Carlson substitute. I am very anxious that legislation should be passed reclassifying the postal field service and also giving a much needed and very greatly justified salary increase in the postal service, as well as the classified service, and the military. Nonetheless, I do not wish to present the President with something which he feels he must veto.

I shall not vote against the substitute; I shall vote for it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield me 1 minute?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield 1 minute to the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I intend to support the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, former chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I believe it is a step in the right direction. I believe reclassification is a necessary part of any postal legislation which may be passed. I believe the Congress should be interested in passing a bill which will benefit the postal workers and which will not be merely an empty gesture by failing to become the law of the land.

I believe the terms of the substitute offered by the Senator from Kansas are equitable. I do not believe the misgivings which some have expressed regarding reclassification have any foundation in fact. Over the course of many years the Congress of the United States has shown an interest in the postal workers. Should anyone in the executive branch of the Government or the Post Office Department abuse his powers under the Reclassification Act, the Congress of the United States can be advised of it and, at a subsequent session, can make such necessary amendments as might be necessary.

I do not believe that either the President of the United States or the Postmaster General wishes to do any injustice to a single postal worker. I do not believe the dire problems which have been mentioned in connection with reclassification will arise.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the amendment of the Senator from Kansas can become the law of the land, and the postal workers can receive the increases indicated.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement showing pay received by persons doing comparable work. The Carlson amendment in the nature of a substitute will, in fact, provide an equitable increase. Since 1945 the cost of living has increased, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 48.6 percent. Under the Carlson substitute, the salary increases in the same 10-year period will show a substantial increase over that amount.

Up to the present time, the starting salaries of postal clerks and letter carriers have already been increased 92 percent in the same period.

Under the Carlson substitute, as I understand, the 10-year pay increase will be brought up to over 100 percent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

The objection has been raised that the Carlson substitute, which is the same as H. R. 4644, does not give the postal workers of this country a sufficient increase in salary to keep pace with the increase in the cost of living.

All of us want to do what is fair and equitable, so I have made some comparisons which I think will be of interest to the Senate.

Since 1945 the cost of living has increased, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 48.6 percent.

The starting salaries of postal clerks and letter carriers have already been increased 92 percent in that same period.

The Carlson amendment in the nature of a substitute would raise that increase to 114 percent, from \$1,700 in 1945 to \$3,640 in 1955, much more than double the figure of 10 years ago.

A man or woman who was earning a starting salary of \$1,700 in 1945 will receive, under the Carlson amendment, an increase in income of 156 percent.

As for a comparison with industry in general, I should like to cite the following figures:

According to the BLS Occupational Wage Survey, 1954, a class A accounting clerk in private industry earns \$3,432 in Boston and \$4,290 in Cleveland. If this position were in the postal field service it would be allocated to salary level 6 in H. R. 4644, and would pay \$3,880 to \$4,630 a year.

A truckdriver in Boston, according to the same survey, is paid \$3,390 per year; in Atlanta and Memphis he is paid \$2,558; in Cleveland he is paid \$4,243. Under H. R. 4644 he would be paid \$3,640 to \$4,360.

A janitor in Boston in private industry earns \$2,683 a year; in Memphis he receives \$2,018; in Cleveland and Chicago he receives \$3,182. H. R. 4644 will pay janitors \$2,870 to \$3,470 a year.

A guard or watchman in a private industrial plant in New York in 1954 was earning \$2,870 to \$3,245. The Post Office Department will pay its guards and watchmen under H. R. 4644 from \$3,330 to \$3,990 a year.

According to the Municipal Year Book, 1954, a truckdriver working for the city government is paid \$3,744 in Philadelphia and \$4,243 in Milwaukee. The Post Office Department under H. R. 4644 would pay \$3,640 to \$4,360.

An automobile mechanic receives \$4,098 from the city of Philadelphia, \$4,576 in Milwaukee, and \$4,909 in San Francisco; H. R. 4644 would pay \$3,880 to \$4,630.

A junior clerk-typist receives \$2,723 from the city of Philadelphia, \$3,360 in Milwaukee, and \$3,840 in San Francisco. H. R. 4644 would pay \$3,330 to \$3,990.

We all want to see the postal employee get a fair increase in salary, but we must be reasonable about this. If a flat 10-percent increase is passed, as provided in S. 1, postal salaries would be thrown out of all proportion insofar as private industry is concerned, and a series of inflationary increases would be started over the country, which would seriously imperil the economy.

S. 1 would cost \$218 million, and would not solve a single problem in the present pay structure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Has all time expired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has not expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom is the time for a quorum call to be charged, all time not having expired?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the time for a quorum call preceding a vote is not chargeable to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Until the time has expired, the time for a quorum call is chargeable to one side or the other. If the Senator from Texas desires to use his time for a quorum call, he may do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call, without the time for the quorum call being charged to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the majority leader. The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McClellan
Allott	Fulbright	McNamara
Anderson	George	Millikin
Barkley	Goldwater	Monroney
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, S. C.	Scott
Chavez	Kefauver	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Dirkens	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Duff	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Eastland	Mansfield	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Flanders	McCarthy	Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Kansas has 3 minutes remaining to him, and the Senator from Texas has 4 minutes remaining to him.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are about to vote on proposed legislation

which would provide pay increases for 500,000 postal employees. There are just two issues before the Senate at the present time. I have offered Senate bill 1489, which provides for an average 7.6 percent increase across the board for the postal workers of this Nation, as a substitute for Senate bill 1, which provides for a 10-percent increase across the board. As a matter of fact, it provides for a minimum increase of \$400, which raises the percentage, but let us say 10 percent.

I wish to say very sincerely I would have liked very much to support the bill providing for a 10-percent increase; but above and beyond that, I want very much to secure a pay raise for the postal workers of the Nation. When we vote for a pay raise for the postal workers we will also vote to increase the salaries of classified Government workers and the salaries of military personnel.

I say very sincerely that, in my opinion, if we pass a bill providing an increase of 10 percent, none of the groups I have mentioned will get a pay increase. The Senate has an opportunity this morning to render a service to 500,000 employees in the postal service, 1½ million employees in the classified service, and 3 million persons in the military service, by keeping the proposed pay increase within the bounds the President has recommended.

I mentioned a few minutes earlier today that the issue is not whether or not the President would veto a bill providing for an additional expenditure of \$20 million or \$40 million. That is not the issue. The President has the responsibility of seeing to it that the Nation's fiscal policy is sound. If the Senate should vote for a 10-percent increase for the postal workers, it will have to vote for a 10-percent increase for the classified employees. The Senate should do so, and I would favor it. The Senate would then have to vote for a 10 percent pay increase for military personnel. The total cost of such an increase would be \$1,476,000,000.

The President sent a message to Congress agreeing to salary increases which would cost about \$1 billion in the three groups I have mentioned.

Why can we not be realistic and vote for the increase provided in the pending amendment, which proposal, in my opinion, would go to the House of Representatives and be accepted, and within 30 days postal workers and other employees could have their pay increases?

If we do not do that, there is grave danger that a pay increase may be delayed, not only for the present, but for this year.

I urged last year that a pay increase should be granted, but the Federal employees did not get it. I think they are entitled to a pay increase. I believe we should vote for a bill which would enable the employees I have mentioned to obtain an increase. Employees of the Government are becoming very much disturbed. I should like to read from a telegram I just received:

Federal employees pay raise becoming political football. Suggest you support less than 10 percent. Avoid Presidential veto.

This is what Federal employees are thinking throughout the country. Therefore I urge that the Senate vote for the substitute I have offered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield my remaining time to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the question now before it is whether it is in favor of a 10-percent increase in pay for Federal employees, or a 6-percent increase, on a sliding scale, up to 63 percent for employees in the higher pay categories.

Another thing which I should like to call to the Senate's attention is the fact that not very long ago Senators voted for themselves an increase in pay of 50 percent, or \$7,500 apiece. Now, when the postal employees come to this body and ask for an increase of 10 percent, some Senators wish to reduce the increase to 6 percent for the employees in the lower pay categories, and have a sliding scale upward for those in the higher categories.

When proponents of the amendment talk about a 7.6-percent increase, they do not mention the fact that that is the average pay increase proposed. That is not the percentage of increase proposed for the majority of the employees, but only for a minority of the employees, those who are in the higher pay brackets.

I believe there has been a little awakening since last year, because some Senators now suggest that the pay increase should be an average of 7.6 percent, when last year a 5-percent pay increase was voted for. I do not believe the mistake will again be made of vetoing a pay increase for many Federal employees who have nothing to do with the Post Office Department. Last year the pay increase involved 70 or 80 percent of Federal employees whose salaries were not affected by postal rates and whether the first-class postage rate should be increased from 3 to 4 cents.

With the various provisions in the amendment, including the sliding scales here and there, I have asked the author of the amendment to tell me what pay the various grades of postmasters would receive. But he does not know; he cannot say. He does not know what interpretations would be placed upon this measure if it were put into effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is a motion to lay on the table the substitute of the Senator from Kansas now in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.



Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the substitute offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the substitute submitted by the Senator from Kansas.

On this question, each side has 45 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that under the unanimous-consent agreement, each side has 45 minutes, even on the question of agreeing to the motion to lay on the table. I am prepared to waive the 45 minutes available to this side, if it will be agreeable to the Senator from Kansas to waive the time available to his side; and then I am prepared to request the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

Mr. CARLSON. I have no objection to having that done, if the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my motion to lay on the table the substitute of the Senator from Kansas.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now yield back the time available to my side.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield back the time available to my side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to lay on the table the substitute of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Frear	McClellan
Allott	Fulbright	McNamara
Anderson	George	Millikin
Barkley	Goldwater	Monroney
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Chavez	Kefauver	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Duff	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Eastland	Mansfield	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Flanders	McCarthy	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to lay on the table the substitute offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—52		
Anderson	Hennings	McClellan
Barkley	Hill	McNamara
Beall	Holland	Monroney
Bible	Humphrey	Morse
Butler	Ives	Murray
Chavez	Jackson	Neely
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kefauver	Pastore
Duff	Kerr	Scott
Ellender	Kuchel	Smathers
Ervin	Langer	Sparkman
Frear	Lehman	Stennis
Fulbright	Long	Symington
George	Magnuson	Thurmond
Gore	Malone	Young
Green	Mansfield	
Hayden	McCarthy	

NAYS—41		
Alken	Curtis	Payne
Allott	Dirksen	Potter
Barrett	Dworshak	Purtell
Bender	Eastland	Robertson
Bennett	Flanders	Saltonstall
Bricker	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Bush	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Jenner	Thye
Capehart	Knowland	Watkins
Carlson	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Case, N. J.	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Millikin	Williams
Cotton	Mundt	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Kennedy Kilgore Russell

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

On this question, the yeas are 52 and the nays are 41; and the motion to lay on the table is agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now call up my motion to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Byrd amendment was agreed to during my absence. I ask that the Byrd amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out through line 24 on page 8, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 7. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of its enactment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the motion to reconsider is agreed to, I intend to offer an amendment to date the increase back to the time the bill was vetoed by a pocket veto of the President last September. I think these employees are entitled to have a Senate vote on that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to yield time?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Byrd amendment was agreed to. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to make sure that there will be a yea-and-nay vote on final passage of the bill. I wonder, from a parliamentary point of view, whether or not the yeas and nays could be now ordered on final passage of the bill, so that Senators will be on notice, without foreclosing the right to offer amendments.

I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished minority leader if he will yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who desired to have me yield some time to him when I did not have it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, in all the years I have been in the Senate I have supported every measure providing a salary increase for postal workers that has come before the Senate. I believe the postal workers should have an increase. I am also thoroughly convinced that if the 10-percent increase is voted, since the House has already acted on that question, there will be nothing to consider in conference. If a 10-percent bill is passed by Congress, I am convinced it

will be vetoed by the President. I am also convinced that such a veto cannot be overridden in Congress. I am speaking for no one except myself. I speak my own conviction.

I believe postal workers should have an increase, but, in my opinion, Senators who are supporting the 10-percent increase are unwittingly, unintentionally, but nevertheless factually creating a situation in which the postal workers will not receive an increase this year. I would support a 7.6-percent increase because I want the postal workers to get at least that much. I would support a greater increase if I thought it had a chance of final adoption. I am convinced it has no chance.

I shall not support a bill merely as a gesture and for the looks of the thing, knowing that in the end it cannot become a law. The postal employees deserve an increase, and they should actually get it. I would support more than a 7-percent increase if I thought there was the least chance of the postal workers getting it. I say that the postal workers themselves—not the lobbyists but the postal workers—should be put in a position where they will get at least a 7.6-percent increase. We should not go through what might be interpreted as a political manipulation for the sake of the record, with the post office employees at long last ending up with no increase at all, but with political ammunition being made available for use in the following campaign.

I am for the postal workers getting an increase. I want to look at the matter from a practical and a commonsense standpoint. I believe they can get a 7.6-percent increase, and I know they deserve it. I would support a greater increase, but I also want to be practical about this matter. That is my position.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the bill on final passage, now that the Carlson substitute has been tabled and any possibility of amending the substitute has been foreclosed by the motion to table.

Mr. President, if the bill passes the Senate, as I believe it will, it will go to the President carrying a 10-percent increase, with no reclassification features. It is my belief it will be an empty gesture. If a bill in that form goes to the President for his signature, it will mean—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not at this point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am willing to yield the Senator some of my time if he will yield to answer a question on the point he has just raised.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield later.

It is my belief that a bill calling for a 10-percent increase in the salaries of postal workers and having no reclassification provisions will not become law. If the bill is vetoed—and it is my belief it will be—I doubt very much that the veto will be overridden.

The Carlson substitute was a fair and equitable proposal to obtain reclassification

and to obtain a salary increase for the postal workers. Such a bill could have been enacted into law. As the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has pointed out, to pass the bill proposing a 10-percent increase will be an empty gesture. Furthermore, we will not have passed a reclassification bill, although most of those who have observed the operation of the Post Office Department for many years believe reclassification is necessary and desirable.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall vote for the bill, because I believe the postal workers should have a salary increase. I would have preferred to have the matter worked out on a compromise basis of possibly 8 percent or 8½ percent. However, that seems to be out of the question now as a result of the last vote. Therefore, I shall vote for the bill, hoping that there will be enacted some beneficial legislation, because the postal workers deserve an increase. I should like to have had an opportunity to help in working out a compromise so that everybody could have been happy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as all time is controlled under the unanimous-consent agreement, an opportunity cannot be afforded to every Senator to express himself on the question. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point in the RECORD my prepared observations on the bill.

There being no objection, Mr. DIRKSEN's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

On the pending measure I am moved by only one desire and that is to make certain that this time there will be a pay raise for postal employees and for all other classified employees in the Federal service. But very frankly it appears to me that we are confronted by the same situation which was before us on August 20, 1954, the last day of the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

Members of the Senate will remember that late in the afternoon, when the resolution to adjourn had already been adopted, the bill providing a 5-percent pay increase for postal workers was under consideration on the floor. The then majority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], offered the administration proposals for an increase in postal rates and graciously warned the Members that if the rate increase was not adopted the bill might encounter a veto. The warning was not heeded. In fact, there was a good deal of polite scoffing and the senior Senator from California was subjected to a rather spirited attack because he uttered the warning.

The best evidence will be found in reading the debate on that afternoon in August of 1954. The postal rate increase amendments were rejected by a vote of 55 to 16 and the bill, without further amendment, then passed by a vote of 69 to 4. At the hour of 10:50 that night, the Senate went home. Three days later, the bill was vetoed by a pocket veto, and the hopes of hundreds of thousands of employees were dashed.

Now it is 8 months later. In the House a bill is pending which provides on the basis

of averages a pay increase of about 7.6 percent and contains reclassification features. This bill would be certain to have the approval of the President. That same bill in the form of a substitute which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has placed before the Senate would by the same token merit approval. So much of the debate as I have been able to hear is a repetition of what occurred on August 20, 1954. The primary question, therefore, is, Shall we enact a pay bill that can be signed into law? There is virtual unanimity that there should be increases in pay and that they should be as generous as can reasonably be achieved. So the only question, therefore, is, What kind of a bill?

The administration position on this issue is very clear in the testimony which it presented to the committees both in the House and Senate. Those who formulated the bill took into account the overall cost, the effect on the Federal budget, the cost-of-living index, the comparable rates in industry, and the fringe benefits which have already been provided.

On the reclassification issue it has been made quite clear that the principle of equal pay for equal work should be preserved and that higher pay for increased responsibilities and higher qualifications should be observed as the very essence of the career system.

There has been spirited opposition in some quarters to the reclassification features in the House bill which are also carried in the Carlson substitute. The Senate bill carries no such provisions, and I think it is informative to go back to the Classification Act itself. It became law on October 28, 1949. It was enacted in the 81st Congress. There was no record vote either in the House or the Senate, and there appeared to be no opposition whatsoever. That was enacted long before President Eisenhower and Postmaster General Summerfield came upon the scene. That bill became law by the signature of President Truman.

Now let me point out that the first section of the act of 1949 reads as follows:

"It is the purpose of this chapter to provide a plan for classification of positions and for rates of basic compensation whereby (1) in determining the rate of basic compensation which an officer or employee shall receive (A) the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work shall be followed and (B) variations in the rates of basic compensation paid to different officers and employees shall be in proportion to substantial differences in difficulty, responsibility, and qualification requirements of work performed and to the contributions of officers and employees to efficiency and economy in the service."

The President did not write that on the statute books. The Postmaster General did not write that on the statute books. It was done by the two Houses of Congress and, to be exact, by Members presently serving in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Nor is that provision discretionary. The law provides that the above-stated principles "shall be followed." The President is responsible for the execution of the law. Congress directed him what to do, and he is doing it. It is now proposed in the bill before us that his recommendation for carrying out the provisions of the Classification Act should be rebuffed.

It may be said that it has not been enforced heretofore. That is scarcely an answer; nor is there anything in the committee bill which repeals the declaration of policy in the Classification Act. If there is, I could not find it; nor is there anything in the committee bill which relieves the President of the mandate which the law places upon him. If there are classification inequities in existing law, the committee bill does not remedy them. If the career principle is to be observed, the committee bill



does not eliminate such inequities and provides no remedy. The act of 1949 has been on the statute books for 5½ years and the question is whether these inequities shall persist year after year or whether we shall remedy them now. It would almost appear to me under this mandate upon the President that he would be compelled to veto a measure which did not remedy the classification inequities.

The pay features have been generously discussed and there is little that I can add. The President has made it quite clear how far budget considerations would permit him to go, and so I can only conclude that the enactment of S. 1 would invite a veto, even as the bill which was passed on the 20th of August 1954 brought forth a veto which could not be considered since Congress adjourned on that day.

I reaffirm my primary and basic interest in the matter and that is to get a reasonably generous pay bill and to do so without delay. It seems to me, therefore, that the logical course to pursue is to support the Carlson substitute and, if that fails, to oppose the committee bill because it is fair to assume from the action taken by the House earlier this week that they might readily concur in S. 1 and thereby invite Executive action which will but delay the pay increases which the postal workers so richly deserve.

I can only add to this the context of the telegram which came to my desk on March 22 and reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 22, 1955.

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,  
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, representing the postmasters, supervisors, rural letter carriers, and special delivery messengers strongly urge you to vote to substitute Senator CARLSON'S S. 1489 for S. 1. The substitute bill would give all employees an equitable raise immediately and would promote the morale and efficiency of the postal service. We believe any other action will delay indefinitely or deprive 500,000 postal employees of a seriously needed salary increase.

NATIONAL RURAL LETTER CARRIERS ASSOCIATION,

WARREN B. BLEDSOE, *President*.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SPECIAL DELIVERY MESSENGERS,

GEORGE L. WARFEL, *President*.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS,

MICHAEL C. NAVE, *President*.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF POSTMASTERS,

C. B. GRAVITT, Jr., *Executive Secretary*.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS OF THE UNITED STATES,

RAYMOND V. MCNAMARA, *President*.

This expresses a realistic view and I can only hope that such a view will prevail in the interest of expeditious action which will actually get a pay bill without delay.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have the same privilege extended to me that was extended to the Senator from Illinois, to insert a statement in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, Mr. BENDER'S statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENDER

I have voted in opposition to the proposal to table the 7.6 percent postal pay raise because I wish to have the opportunity of supporting a compromise suggestion authorizing an 8.6 percent raise for postal workers.

It has always been my conviction that Government employees should be encouraged to remain in our service through the payment of attractive wages. We should strive for efficiency in our Federal departments by eliminating unnecessary workers, but those who are employed should be given every incentive to remain so long as they do their work efficiently and sincerely.

Our postal employees are people whom we have retained in service largely by reason of what was once considered an adequate retirement program. Today, this has lost much of its appeal because of rising living costs. We owe it to the thousands of people who are dependent upon their salaries in the postal service to give them every possible opportunity. I think that the proposed 8.6 percent postal raise can be provided within the framework of our Government's program of economy and I hope that it will be enacted by the Congress and approved by the President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have one request from a Senator to speak for 1 minute. I am prepared to yield back all my time except 1 minute, if that is agreeable to the minority leader.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to speak for 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from California is prepared to yield back all time except 1 minute, I am prepared to do likewise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to inquire whether any other Senators desire me to yield time to them. I understand the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], each would like to speak for 1 minute. I first yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has very well expressed my feeling in regard to the pending legislation. I wish to make the additional point that there is now before the Armed Services Committee a bill to increase the pay of those in the Armed Services by approximately 6.7 percent. That bill has been approved by the House. There is also before the Senate a bill to raise the pay of the classified employees. If the postal pay bill is vetoed, as it has been suggested it may be, the postal employees will be without an increase in pay, at a time when the classified workers and those in the Armed Services will be receiving a pay increase. Therefore the postal employees will be at a disadvantage with the other Government employees, including members of the Armed Services.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me 1 minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I also wish to join in the sentiments expressed so ably by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I am sorry that we find ourselves in a predicament whereby it is certainly possible, if not probable, that legislation granting salary increases to postal employees will not become law at this session. I am certain that the 10-percent bill, S. 1, will be vetoed by the President.

I shall vote for S. 1, in the hope that the House will stand by its bill and that in conference a figure may be agreed upon which will be satisfactory to the administration. I am sorry that an amendment providing for an increase of 8.6 percent was not offered to S. 1, as I would have supported such a provision. I wish to say, Mr. President, that should S. 1 pass in its present form, and if the Chief Executive disapproves the bill, I shall not vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from California is prepared to yield back the remainder of his time, I shall be glad to yield back all of my time except 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] does not desire to speak. I have no further requests for time, and therefore I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, in order that the Senate may vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back all my time, except 2 minutes which I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the postal pay bill has not passed the House of Representatives. The House a few days ago refused to be gagged and compelled to rubber-stamp an administration bill. The bill is now pending before the Rules Committee by a two-thirds vote of the House, because they did not wish the bill of the Postmaster General to be rammed down their throats, and did not want to be dictated to by the Postmaster General. He attempted to dictate to us last year, and his action contributed toward bringing about a Presidential veto, in the face of the President's statement that the postal workers were entitled to a pay increase. But the President vetoed the bill, and for many months the postal workers have been denied the pay raise which the Congress by an overwhelming vote had given to them.

I feel that we must stand on our feet and pass the kind of legislation which is necessary to meet the conditions we face, and not be confronted every inch of the way, as we have been in the committee and on the floor, with the statement that we shall have a Presidential veto thrown at us—not by the President but by Mr. Summerfield, the Postmaster General.

Mr. President, I am becoming tired of being confronted with situations of that kind.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, dealing with the 10-percent pay increase for postal employees, be printed in the RECORD, together with an article dealing with the same subject, written by William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TEN-PERCENT PAY INCREASE FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES IS MERITED

As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have had the opportunity to follow closely the testimony which

has been given on the alternative proposals for pay increases for the field service of the Post Office Department. I am convinced that anything less than the 10-percent raise provided by S. 1, of which I am a cosponsor, would be inadequate.

#### VETO OF PAY BILL DESTROYED EMPLOYEE MORALE

When President Eisenhower last summer vetoed the salary increase then adopted by the 83d Congress—which was under the leadership of his own party—it was a bitter disappointment to hundreds of thousands of postal employees and their families. The president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in his testimony before our committee, said that the morale of the postal service reached an all-time low on August 23, 1954, when the President vetoed the bill known as H. R. 7774. I can say from my own experience—and I am sure the experience of other Senators agrees with mine—that this was indeed the case. Scores of individual clerks, mail handlers, and letter carriers told me last fall, and hundreds have written me since I have come to the Senate, of the unfairness which they feel has characterized the personnel policies of the present administration.

Now the administration has introduced a proposal, S. 1489, which, among other provisions, offers the postal employees a pay increase of 6 percent or, with certain adjustments in pay grades, 7½ percent. And we have again heard suggestions from the White House that any increase larger than that voted by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee—this includes the increase contemplated by S. 1, for example—may again be vetoed by President Eisenhower.

I think that this attitude of the administration is completely unjustified. The administration took a long time to recommend even the modest increases of S. 773. As the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] pointed out to the Postmaster General during the committee hearings, they were almost a year in recommending a 5-percent raise, and that year is past without any pay raise; yet there is no allowance for making up the loss to the postal employees.

Let us hope, at least, that the President has given up the quaint notion that those Federal employees who work in the post offices cannot get fair salaries until they produce sufficient postal revenues to pay for themselves. Let us hope that he has had some second thoughts since last August, when he vetoed the 1954 pay-raise bill because it did not include rate increases to bring the necessary additional revenue into the Post Office.

I should like to point out the great danger posed to our rural people by the claim that the Post Office should make a profit. Only about 6 percent of the 40,000 post offices in America pay their own way. Naturally, the post offices which lose the most money are in remote agricultural regions, where R. F. D. routes are long and expensive, and the population is comparatively small. To insist that the postal operation be on a money-making basis might lead to the elimination of many rural postal services. Yet these services are absolutely essential to maintain a sound agricultural economy and to provide necessary communication between our farm people and the rest of the population.

#### POST OFFICE IS A PUBLIC SERVICE, NOT A BUSINESS

The function of the postal service is what the name implies—service to the public. It is not a profit-seeking enterprise. If it were a profitable business, no doubt we should very soon hear that its continued operation by the Government is creeping socialism, and that the Government should get out of the mail business and turn it back to private enterprise. But it is not meant to be a business—it is a public service.

We do not increase the charges for passports and visas before giving the immigration service a pay boost. When we lower our tariffs under a reciprocal trade agreement, we do not cut the salaries of our customs officers. If each of our Federal services had to pay its way, the FBI and our armed services would disappear, including the generals. We would soon have nothing left but the Internal Revenue Service, which of course would be due for very substantial salary increases.

The absurdity of this position was plain last summer, and I trust it has been abandoned now. The determination of proper postal rates requires separate consideration and judgment on its own merits. But an increase in the compensation of the men and women who serve the public in the Nation's post office is long overdue. The need has been established and is now recognized even by the administration, albeit inadequately. I therefore support enactment of S. 1 as reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

[From the American Federationist for April 1955]

#### STOP KICKING THE POSTAL WORKERS AROUND

(By William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers)

For those in private industry whose wages and working conditions are determined by collective bargaining processes, the procedure for establishing Federal salaries presents somewhat of a mystery. A man from Mars would probably be no more at a loss to understand governmental procedures than the average outside observer from our own planet.

This observation will be more easily accepted once it is understood that adjustment of Federal salaries does not generally follow the pattern of accepted economic standards or practices.

For example, the income needs of Government workers as measured against prices, living standards, and other accepted economic factors in wage disputes are almost entirely neglected. It is not that these needs are unacknowledged and then simply ignored for the most part. A classic example is to be found in the testimony of two responsible administration spokesmen before congressional committees in the 1951 wage hearings.

Both the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the Postmaster General at that time told Congress a minimum increase of 21 percent was required to restore 1939 purchasing power to the postal employees. This testimony certainly acknowledged the economic distress of the postal employees. However, having bowed in the direction of the facts in the case, these same spokesmen actually recommended less than 7 percent.

Another peculiarity of government is the absence of the human factor in wage negotiations. It is readily conceded this same void too often exists in salary determinations in private industry. However, the absence of the profit factor in government has the tendency to eliminate the human factor and substitute political considerations. A corporation showing high profits is more inclined to pay better wages, if not because of human impulses, at least in recognition of the fact that continued profits and high production depend in a large degree on satisfied employees. Government seemingly believes it is not necessary to follow this pattern, although it would be an equally effective self-serving device to its operation.

The monopolistic features of government make it virtually impossible to place a market value on the skills of an employee as can be done in a vigorously competitive industry.

Let us take a corporation which embarks on an expansion program. In the process more goods are finished and sold. The result is generally higher profits. The employee

whose livelihood depends on how the market prices his labor can reasonably expect to participate in the company's increased profits in the form of better wages.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the opposite is true in government. Our Federal Government continues to grow. More and more services are made available to business, farmers, and other segments of our citizenry. The bigger our Federal system grows, the greater is the tendency to meet the cost of expansion from the employees' payroll.

In recent years a new type of thinking has permeated Government spending. It's the businessman's outlook. He both likes and dislikes Government spending. He likes it when it directly or indirectly enables business interests to progress, profits to increase, and dividends to multiply. But he is the first to label it "ruinous" when the knife cuts the other way, that is, when the conditions of organized labor and others who work for a living are improved.

Everybody remembers when the excess profits tax was ended. The move was hailed far and wide by big business. What it did to the Public Treasury and the already unbalanced budget was lost in the scramble to clip coupons and otherwise reap the windfall that came from increased corporation dividends. That was the kind of government action that "made sense" to businessmen in Government.

About the same time, postal and other Government workers were striving to secure a modest pay increase. No adjustment in wages had been made in almost 4 years, despite mounting prices and shrinking purchasing power. The Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, had the answer when the knife began to cut the other way.

The employees' request, piously proclaimed Mr. Summerfield, was nothing more than a "raid of the Treasury." That was the fore-runner of this year's charge of "fiscal irresponsibility" pinned on the proposal to reduce personal income taxes by \$20.

Practically every consideration of postal wages since the days of Ben Franklin has been saddled with the so-called postal deficit. Probably no other phase of government has been so widely publicized and so misunderstood as the cost of operating the postal establishment.

Postal deficits are composed of many things, not insufficient postage rates alone as some would have us believe. Not the least of the various contributing factors is the tremendous operating loss incurred in maintaining postal service wherever there are mail users. There are over 40,000 post offices, of which probably not more than 6 percent pay their way. It is not difficult to imagine how long private enterprise would maintain a like number of nonprofit branch offices. No small portion of the remaining annual cost results from public service policies approved by Congress. These consist of free and less-than-cost items carried as a matter of public service and in the general interest of all citizens.

Whether these policies shall be continued or eliminated should have no influence on employee wages. In the absence of any resolution of this age-old controversy, the employees should not be asked or expected to underwrite a portion of operating costs out of their wages.

There are those who use the specious argument that employee wages cannot be adjusted because the postal service already costs taxpayers too much money. It will no doubt come as a surprise to this group to learn that several functions and departments of Government are more costly than the Post Office Department. Proof of this statement will be found in the 1956 budget figures recently sent to Congress.

Table 7, on page A-14 of the Budget for Fiscal Year 1956, shows for the first time a comparison of the cost of the Federal Gov-



ernment's benefits to business, labor, farmers, veterans, and other groups in the economy. The figures are quite revealing.

Heading the list are the veterans' benefits, which cost the Government approximately \$4½ billion each year. Next come the farmers, who receive from \$750 million to \$1 billion annually, depending on the level of price supports. Business is listed as receiving benefits totaling \$900 million. Included in this figure is the postal deficit charged to business because it presumably arises from losses sustained in handling the various classes of mail.

Our particular interest, however, was focused on the figures described by the imposing title, "Applicable Receipts of Public Enterprise Funds and Their Effect on Budget Expenditures." Reduced to simple language, these figures disclosed how much money each function and agency of Government received through general appropriations, the amount of receipts derived from outside Government sources, and the resulting net budget expenditure for each agency.

The figures for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 are shown in the table reproduced at the bottom of this page.

It requires no more than a cursory study of these figures to discover that only 2 agencies cost less than the Post Office Department in fiscal 1954; in fiscal 1955 the number was 3. Taking 1954 as a typical year, it will be found that postal operations resulted in only 0.4 percent of the \$67.7 billion net budget expenditures.

In other words, postal revenue almost matched costs. Compare this 0.4 percent cost with other agencies: Independent offices, 9.5 percent; General services, 1.1 percent; House and Home Finance, 0.9 percent; Agriculture, 4.3 percent; Commerce, 1.4 percent; Defense (military functions), 59.5 percent; Defense (civil functions), 0.8 percent; Health, Education, and Welfare, 2.9 percent; Interior, 0.7 percent; Justice, 0.2 percent; Labor, 0.5 percent; State, 0.2 percent; Treasury, 10.8 percent.

A logical conclusion to the argument that wages should depend on income would mean the end of most Government functions and agencies. The appropriation for the legislative branch in fiscal 1954, for example, amounted to \$58.9 million. No receipts are shown as public enterprise funds, so that the entire appropriation was a net budget expenditure.

Does this mean Congress should be dissolved because it is not paying its way? That would be senseless. No one in his right mind would even suggest the thought.

Does it mean Senators and House Members should not be paid a fair salary because the legislative branch does not pay its way? Of course it does not mean that. As a matter of fact, congressional wages were increased to \$22,500 a few days ago. The approval was made on the basis of fairness and equity and not solely on living costs. There was no reference to income expenditures of the legislative branch or the existence of a deficit in its operations.

92 percent. The great increase in volume handled over employment meant that a single employee handled 20 percent more mail per year in 1952 than in 1938."

This very thorough Senate investigation demonstrated the unmistakable role played by postal workers in both the increased productivity of the Nation and the postal service since 1938. Yet this is being completely ignored. The result is the worker is deprived of his historical participation in increased productivity.

There are those, too, who call on postal and other Federal employees to accept inadequate wages in the name of patriotism. This has been an infrequent suggestion, to be sure, but occasionally it is advanced.

Government workers are no different than other wage earners in shops, offices, and factories wherever located. They have no magic formulas or hidden tricks by which they can defy or even suspend the normal laws of economics.

By the same token, it is not profaning patriotism to insist that pious platitudes are no substitute for income. Statistics are not exchangeable for rent, food, and necessary personal services. There is nothing except income that a wage earner can use to purchase food, warmth, shelter, to say nothing of recreation and the health and education of his children. The presence of these conditions is the thing which converts existence into living. The absence of adequate income can only mean one or more of these must suffer. The inevitable result is an economically ill family.

Postal employees and other Government workers have had no wage adjustment since July 1951. Congress did approve a modest salary increase last year, only to have the President disapprove it by means of a pocket veto. In refusing to sign the bill, President Eisenhower stated, in part: "It ignores the necessity of revenue to pay for salary increase." Reference here was to the disinclination of Congress to tie in a postage-rate-increase bill.

The veto message did not concern itself about the need of a wage increase. There was no rebuttal to the justification for an adequate income. Again it was a case of using the postal operating deficit as a "whipping boy." The political overtones in reference to the failure to increase postage rates should not be overlooked.

Federal employees again are asking Congress to approve salary legislation. The executive council of the American Federation of Labor has unanimously endorsed bills pending before Congress to provide a 10-percent increase. This is described by the council as a "minimum amount due Government personnel."

The council's statement called on Congress and the executive branch of Government to take a constructive and nonpolitical view of the need for adequate salaries. Declared the council:

"The cost of government is properly the concern of each of us. No one advocates useless spending or the waste of our Public Treasury. However, in the matter of wages for Federal employees, there is involved a very human question as well as a moral obligation on the part of those responsible for determining salaries. The human question can be satisfied only if the worker is given a wage that will enable him to provide decent and adequate care for his family. A moral responsibility exists as long as Federal employees do not have collective-bargaining rights and in the absence of economic privileges accorded workers in private industry in a given wage dispute."

To those who refuse to recognize this human equation and moral obligation and to those who say it will not work, the cynical postal employee might say what George

Agency	1954			1955		
	Gross budget expenditures	Applicable receipts	Net budget expenditures	Gross budget expenditures	Applicable receipts	Net budget expenditures
Independent offices.....	\$9,950,288,256	\$3,477,478,076	\$6,472,810,180	\$9,647,449,839	\$2,559,257,179	\$7,088,192,660
General Services Administration.....	808,228,980	2,692,389	805,536,591	1,173,501,645	4,322,112	1,169,179,533
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	1,440,178,631	2,054,772,590	614,593,959	1,666,817,211	1,481,465,471	185,351,740
Department of Agriculture.....	5,963,486,471	3,048,016,548	2,915,469,923	7,364,748,085	3,940,614,232	3,424,133,853
Department of Commerce.....	1,083,467,206	83,580,113	999,887,183	1,179,577,228	19,069,318	1,160,507,910
Department of Defense:						
Military functions.....	40,336,252,986	479,753	40,335,773,233	34,375,430,700	430,700	34,375,000,000
Civil functions.....	707,809,290	102,725,752	605,083,538	624,092,895	92,650,681	531,442,214
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	1,982,518,859	1,488,797	1,981,030,062	2,042,096,626	1,731,567	2,040,365,059
Department of the Interior.....	570,551,588	35,412,011	535,139,577	594,495,367	31,682,392	562,812,975
Department of Justice.....	182,643,091	-----	182,643,091	185,379,295	-----	185,379,295
Department of Labor.....	356,527,622	2,013,344	354,514,278	432,656,103	1,098,000	431,467,103
Post Office Department.....	2,686,297,013	2,374,591,710	311,705,303	2,740,605,808	2,472,951,701	267,654,107
Department of State.....	156,465,826	-----	156,465,826	137,917,329	-----	139,917,329
Treasury Department.....	7,339,117,951	366,990	7,338,750,961	7,732,406,717	608,410,087	7,123,996,630

A similar situation exists with respect to the judiciary. The appropriation was \$28.3 million in fiscal 1954. No applicable receipts are listed. Should this mean the dissolution of the judiciary? Should it mean underpaid judges in our Federal courts? We think the answer is obvious on both counts. The Department of Defense, for both military and civil functions, accounted for more than 60 percent of the net expenditures shown. Should military pay be based on income? Certainly not, no more than a city government is expected to pay policemen and firemen on the basis of income realized by the police and fire departments.

Historically, postal wages have been considered in the light of postal deficits and to a lesser degree living costs. Invariably there is a generous mixture of political expediency involved. This approach to the wage problem is neither in accord with historic experience nor the laws of economics.

Wages are not quite so simple a problem; they are a complex of competitive forces, cost of living, productivity of the national economy, productivity of the individual firm and worker, collective bargaining, the American goal of a constantly rising standard of living and the demands of an economy predicated on mass production for a market through mass consumption. We find it impossible to adopt the simple and untenable

theory of wages voiced by those who neglect increased productivity. Management has ever been vociferous in proclaiming that wages (in given wage disputes) could not be raised without a corresponding rise in productivity. Clearly, if wages are kept down because of inadequate productivity, they should be raised in accord with adequate and increased productivity.

It is a statistical fact that the postal service performs a variety of vital economic functions. A Senate study in 1954 made the following findings:

"Over the years postal revenues have tended to move with the total volume of goods and services the Nation produces. Both have risen, with postal revenues advancing faster.

"During World War II the Nation increased its per capita output more than 50 percent, and the post office gross per capita income advanced fully 75 percent. Since 1946, gains in postal revenues have continued to outstrip the increases in production."

"In 1938 pieces handled per man-year were 84.3 thousands; in 1952 they were 101.4 thousands."

"The overall picture, comparing 1938 to 1952, has been one of increased employment, increased volume, and increased productivity. From 1938 to 1952, employment increased 59 percent, while volume in pieces went up

Bernard Shaw once said of Christianity: "The only trouble with it is that it has never been tried."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 21, as follows:

#### YEAS—72

Alken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hill	Neuberger
Bible	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bush	Humphrey	Pastore
Butler	Ives	Payne
Capehart	Jackson	Potter
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Chavez	Kefauver	Smithers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thurmond
Eastland	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Malone	Welker
Ervin	Mansfield	Wiley
Frear	McCarthy	Young

#### NAYS—21

Bricker	Flanders	Millikin
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Byrd	Hruska	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Curtis	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin, Pa.	Williams

#### NOT VOTING—3

Kennedy	Kilgore	Russell
---------	---------	---------

So the bill (S. 1) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY BILL, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 61, Senate bill 67, known as the classified employees pay bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 67) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

"Grade	
1.....	\$2,700
2.....	3,050
3.....	3,300
4.....	3,575
5.....	3,850
6.....	4,275
7.....	4,725
8.....	5,175
9.....	5,650
10.....	6,125
11.....	6,600
12.....	7,800
13.....	9,100
14.....	10,400
15.....	11,700
16.....	13,000
17.....	14,100
18.....	14,800

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for shall be as follows:

"Grade	
1.....	\$1,900
2.....	2,550
3.....	2,700
4.....	3,050
5.....	3,300
6.....	3,575
7.....	3,850
8.....	4,275
9.....	4,725
10.....	5,175

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,870 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$3,030 per annum."

(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date;

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between 2 scheduled or 2 longevity rates, or between a scheduled rate and a longevity rate, provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the 2 corresponding rates in effect on and after such date;

(3) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in such maximum longevity rate;

(4) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in the rate for like positions under such section;

(5) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That (a) section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the general schedule shall be as follows:

Per annum rates					
\$2,800	\$2,900	\$3,000	\$3,100	\$3,200	\$3,300
3,150	3,250	3,350	3,450	3,550	3,650
3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
3,675	3,775	3,875	3,975	4,075	4,175
4,000	4,150	4,300	4,450	4,600	4,750
4,425	4,575	4,725	4,875	5,025	5,175
4,875	5,025	5,175	5,325	5,475	5,625
5,325	5,475	5,625	5,775	5,925	6,075
5,800	5,950	6,100	6,250	6,400	6,550
6,275	6,425	6,575	6,725	6,875	7,025
6,825	7,050	7,275	7,500	7,725	
8,050	8,300	8,550	8,800	9,050	
9,350	9,600	9,850	10,100	10,350	
10,650	10,900	11,150	11,400	11,650	
11,950	12,200	12,450	12,700		
13,250	13,500	13,750	14,000		
14,350	14,600				

the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule

Per annum rates				
\$1,970	\$2,040	\$2,110	\$2,180	\$2,250
2,630	2,710	2,790	2,870	2,950
2,800	2,900	3,000	3,100	3,200
3,150	3,250	3,350	3,450	3,550
3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
3,675	3,775	3,875	3,975	4,075
4,000	4,150	4,300	4,450	4,600
4,425	4,575	4,725	4,875	5,025
4,875	5,025	5,175	5,325	5,475
5,325	5,475	5,625	5,775	5,925
				6,075

is in a position in grade 16 or 17 of the general schedule, and is receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade as provided in this section, he shall continue to receive basic compensation without change in rate until (A) he leaves such position or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended.

(c) Each officer or employee (1) who with his position has been transferred from the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule or the general schedule to a prevailing rate schedule pursuant to title I of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), prior to the effective date of this section, (2) who is on such effective date being compensated under such prevailing rate schedule, and (3) whose rate of basic compensation is less on the effective date of this section than the rate to which he would have been entitled on such effective date if such transfer had not occurred (unless he is receiving such lesser rate by reason of an adverse personnel action resulting from his own fault), shall be paid basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he would have been receiving on such effective date (including compensation for each within-grade and longevity step increase, which he would have earned) if such transfer had not occurred until the day immediately following such effective date, until (A) he leaves the position which he holds on such effective date, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate under prevailing rate schedules; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such prevailing rate schedules.



Sec. 2. The Civil Service Commission shall make (1) a study of the effects and desirability of eliminating present grades 6, 8, and 10 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, including the desirability of changes in the salary ranges of the remaining grades of the General Schedule that should accompany the elimination of grades 6, 8, and 10, and (2) a study of the effects and desirability of establishing for supervisors whose compensation is fixed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and who regularly have responsibility for the supervision of employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates, rates of compensation not less than 5 percent above the highest rate of basic compensation being paid to any such prevailing rate employee regularly supervised. The Commission shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Senate at the earliest possible date, setting forth its findings and such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

Sec. 3. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to section 62 (2) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or who are appointed pursuant to section 792 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby increased by 10 percent or \$200 per annum, whichever is greater.

(b) The limitations of \$10,560 and \$14,355 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the paragraph under the heading "Salaries of Supporting Personnel" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 470, 83d Cong.), or in any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

(c) Section 753 (e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out "\$6,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$6,600."

Sec. 4. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government (other than an employee in the office of a Senator) whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 10 percent of the aggregate rate of his basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, the provisions under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, and the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), except that no such officer or employee shall be paid additional compensation at a rate less than \$200 per annum.

(b) Section 2 (b) of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), is amended by striking out "\$11,646" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,810."

(c) (1) The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators is hereby increased by—

(A) \$5,220 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is less than 3 million;

(B) \$6,120 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 3 million or more but less than 5 million;

(C) \$6,960 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 5 million or more but less than 10 million; and

(D) \$7,080 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 10 million or more.

(2) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U. S. C. 60f), is amended by striking out "\$5,880" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$6,540"; by striking out "\$7,320" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,160"; and by striking out "\$8,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$9,180."

(3) Notwithstanding the third proviso in such paragraph, any increase in the compensation of an employee in a Senator's office shall take effect on the effective date of this act or on the date such employee became employed, whichever is later, if (A) the certification filed by such Senator under such proviso so provides, (B) such certification is filed in the disbursing office of the Senate not later than 15 days following the date of enactment of this act, and (C) the amount of such increase does not exceed the amount of the increase which would be payable in the case of such employee if he were subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section plus any additional amount which may result from fixing the rate of basic compensation at the lowest multiple of \$60 which will result in an increase not less than the amount of such increase which would be payable under subsection (a).

(d) The rates of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the legislative counsel of the Senate, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, and the coordinator of information of the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 10 percent.

(e) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate," or the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent expenses of the House," in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 470, 83d Cong.). The limitations contained in such paragraphs are hereby increased by 10 percent.

(f) The Official Reporters of Proceedings and Debates of the Senate and their employees shall be considered to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of subsection (a) and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection.

(g) The additional compensation provided by subsection (a) and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

Sec. 5. Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of \$14,800 per annum."

Sec. 6. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, 79th Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 10 percent or \$200 per annum, whichever is greater.

(b) Section 8 (d) of Public Law 293, 79th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out "\$12,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$14,080."

Sec. 7. The rates of basic compensation provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 10 percent or \$200 per annum, whichever is greater.

Sec. 8. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, no rate of compensation which is \$14,800 or more per annum shall be increased by this act, and no rate of compensation shall be increased by this act to an amount in excess of \$14,800 per annum.

Sec. 9. (a) This act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins after December 31, 1954, but no payment shall be required to be made under this act before the first day of the first pay period which begins more than 60 days after enactment.

(b) Retroactive compensation under this act shall be paid only in case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the effective date of the act and ending with the date of his retirement, or for service rendered by a deceased officer or employee during the period beginning with the effective date of this act and ending with the date of his death.

(c) Pay increases comparable to those provided by this act but granted by administrative action pursuant to law may be made retroactively effective on the same basis as if they had been provided by this act.

(d) The rate of compensation of any employee who was changed from a position, the compensation of which was fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates, to a position under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and placed in the appropriate step of the grade during the period beginning with the effective date of this act and ending with the first day of the first pay period for which payment is made under this act, shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with the new rate provided by this act for the step in which he was placed at the time of such assignment.

(e) The rate of compensation of any employee who was promoted from one grade under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to another such grade and placed in the appropriate step of the grade during the period beginning with the effective date of this act and ending with the first day of the first pay period for which payment is made under this act shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with the new rate provided by this act for the step in which he was placed at the time of such assignment.

(f) The retroactive salary increase payable under the provisions of this act to any employee who transfers from one establishment of the Government to another between the effective date of this act and the first day of the first pay period for which payment is made under this act shall be chargeable to the appropriation or funds of the establishment from which the employee transferred for the period from the effective date of this act to the date of such transfer.

(g) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, changes in the rates of compensation which result from the enactment of this act shall be deemed to be effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of such enactment.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is planned to consider the classified pay bill, and, if possible, to take action on it this afternoon.

If the Senate completes action on the classified pay bill today, the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] plans to present the conference report on the tax bill, which it is hoped can be agreed to. It is then proposed to have the Senate recess until Monday.

# ILLEGALLY HELD PRISONERS OF WAR—RESOLUTION BY LOS ANGELES COUNTY (CALIF.) COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a resolution passed by the Los Angeles County Council of the American Legion, Department of California, which reads as follows:

## RESOLUTION ON ILLEGALLY HELD PRISONERS OF WAR

Whereas the People's Republic of China, known as Red China, in a reply to an invitation to discuss the Formosan situation before the United Nations, replied in substance, as follows:

1. Red China would agree to send a representative only after Nationalist China "has been driven out from the Security Council" and Red China seated in its stead.

2. Even if the Council expelled Nationalist China, Red China would send a representative "only for the purpose of discussing the resolution of the Soviet Union" which condemns United States aggression in the Formosa area; and

Whereas besides the 11 admitted United States military personnel now in Chinese prisons, there are upward of 800 United States military personnel held in prison on the pretext that Red China was not a party in and to the so-called Korean police action; and

Whereas the facts are that these United States military personnel should have been treated as prisoners of war and thus been released at the exchange of prisoners of war at Panmunjom; and

Whereas any move to meet with Red China should only be after Red China had released these illegally held United States military personnel; and

Whereas the failure to do so would result in once more placing us on the defensive and once more proving that the umbrella-waving Munich type of peace at any price results only in more and more aggressive and arrogant moves from totalitarian dictatorships: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Los Angeles County Council of the American Legion, Department of California, in regular meeting held February 4, 1955, That the United States of America take a forthright and aggressive stand on this matter and not permit itself to be swayed by actions predicated upon timidity and subordination of national honor which will result only in failure, loss of position, and so-called loss of face or prestige, all of which will not result in the release of our military prisoners of war; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and the Congress of the United States, to the two California Senators, and to all local newspapers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I again wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the airmen re-

ferred to in the resolution I have just read have been held as prisoners by the Chinese Communists since they were shot down over Korea prior to the Korean Armistice, which was on or about January 12, 1953.

Mr. Hammarskjold's mission to Peking was in January 1955. There have been no affirmative reports of any improvement in the situation, and there is no indication that the United Nations mission has succeeded, or that there is any prospect of its succeeding.

I urge that the United States representative to the United Nations be called upon to obtain from Mr. Hammarskjold a final report on what, if anything, he has been able to accomplish in this regard. Then I think the Government of the United States must determine what steps, if any, it is prepared to take relative to the release of the 15 American airmen wearing the uniform of the United States, who are being held illegally by the Chinese Communists, in violation of the Korean Armistice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## BASIC SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE TALBOTT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, early this week a great Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Harold E. Talbott, made an excellent address in my home State of Maine—sometimes considered 1 great big air base, since we have 5 major air installations in Maine, the northernmost outpost of the United States.

Because what the Secretary said merits the most serious consideration of each Member of this body, in that it concerns the very key to the basic security of our country, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HAROLD E. TALBOTT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE PRESQUE ISLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MARCH 22, 1955

It is always a privilege and a pleasure to visit a community in which the Air Force and civilian interests are tied so closely together. I want to congratulate all of you for the spirit of cooperation that I find here. I am sure that each of you is vitally interested in the activities of the Air Force. You all have your ideas as to what your Air Force stands for in providing for our country's security. However, after serving for 2 years as your Secretary, I would like to give you my own feelings as to the importance of the Air Force.

I need not tell you of the ever-constant threat to our country, to the free world, and to our way of life. The only real protection against this threat is strength. In our strength lies our security. Any drop in our strength would be an open invitation to the Communists to increase the pressure of their constant aggression.

You might ask how large should the Armed Forces be, or how large should the Air Force be to give us proper strength. Let me speak of the Air Force. There is no ab-

solute measure of strength. We can only build our forces to meet the strength of our possible enemies. We must constantly evaluate and change our forces to match any increases or the possible decreases in the strength of the enemy.

During this period as your Secretary of the Air Force, one observation has struck me. Your Air Force is truly dedicated to peace. I have been impressed by the determination of the professional airman, the professional soldier, to avoid war. Many of them have gone through three great conflicts during their period of service, and they all tell how suicidal and how terrible a future war might be. These men, who know only too well the ravages and devastation that follows war, are truly determined to do everything in their power to insure against further war. They know, however, that the military forces in a democracy can only be as strong as the citizen, the voter, the taxpayer, desire it to be. It is for that reason I am telling you tonight that although we are not in a shooting war, the potential threat to our security has never been greater. Our security truly depends on keeping our country strong, both militarily and economically.

On the military side of the ledger our country is strong, probably stronger than we have been at any time in our history. We intend to keep it strong, and to make it stronger. Your Air Force, the keystone upon which the Armed Forces in the United States is based, gets stronger every day. Perhaps I am biased, but I believe that your Air Force today represents the most powerful and best-trained military force the world has ever known. You can well be proud of it.

On the economic side we have had a phenomenon happening during the last 10 years. During World War II this country had to choose between butter and bullets—we chose bullets. At the opening of the Korean war we found again there were shortages in certain critical materials and in our ability to produce, and we were again forced to maintain certain restrictions to our civilian economy. Today, however, shortages have been eliminated, both in terms of critical materials and our ability to produce. Today we have a total economy made up of a war economy, plus a peace economy.

To do this our industries have been expanded so that they can accommodate both the requirement of an ever-expanding civilian populace with an ever-growing standard of living, and the requirements of the largest peacetime military force ever maintained in our history.

In view of the continued threat to our security these military forces will be maintained indefinitely. Consequently, we can see that our total production for a good many years to come will include not only the requirement for our peacetime living, but the requirement to keep our military forces always equipped with the best that our science and technology can produce. Quality, and not size, will be the measure of success in a future war.

I would like to tell you of our biggest problems in the Air Force. It is a problem of people. It is a problem that must be solved if we are to maintain and increase the capability of the Air Force. Your Air Force has expanded since 1950 from a strength of 48 wings and 411,000 people to a present strength of 121 wings and some 950,000 people. The enlisted ranks of the Air Force are made up of volunteers. Since the Air Force cannot go out and hire trained and skilled personnel to maintain its valuable and highly intricate equipment, we must train each new man to do a job. In the tremendous buildup that followed the outbreak of the Korean war we trained hundreds of thousands of young men to do the many jobs that are required to keep our airplanes flying and our equipment working. Our problem is that we have not been able to make the



Air Force career sufficiently attractive to keep enough of these young men who have done such a fine job for us in the service. This year, for instance, we will lose \$2¼ billion worth of trained personnel. We know that if we make the Air Force career sufficiently attractive, more of these fine young men will stay with us. Consequently, we have undertaken a campaign to correct many of the problems and to make the Air Force career competitive with careers in civilian life.

The biggest problem we found was pay. As a result of a long program to emphasize the need and advantages of proper pay to our service personnel, it appears that Congress will this year pass a new pay bill. This bill will give selected pay raises to individuals in the armed services and should go a long way to making our service career more attractive.

The second problem which affects the decision of our personnel, especially the trained veterans whom we need desperately, is housing. The Air Force therefore is turning its principal attention from pay to housing. I am personally concerned over this problem of obtaining family housing of proper standards and within the proper rental brackets for the men in the Air Force.

To tell you the magnitude of this problem we estimate that the Air Force has some 300,000 families that are not properly housed. The Air Force has obtained a considerable quantity of housing. The housing inventory has gone from the World War II level of about 2,500 sets to a present 68,000. In addition, many communities have assisted by making rental property available to our people. Many of the units which we list as available housing, however, are below the standards which you and I would consider attractive and comfortable enough for our own families. I would cite some of the housing available here at Presque Isle, which I looked at today, as being in this category. Unless we can provide reasonable housing for our personnel, they just refuse to stay in the service. Neither you nor I can blame them for it.

We have two ways of replacing this housing. The first method is for the Government to come in and put up the money and build housing on the base. The second is to depend on private funds to provide housing we need. The Air Force is in favor of any measure that will give us additional housing. I would be delighted if we could work it out with private interests in your community to provide rental housing of a proper standard and at a reasonable cost for our personnel. I say rental housing because I do not feel it is good to force military personnel whose tours of duty will normally not exceed 3 or 4 years at any one base to buy a house. Unless they plan to settle in a community, they must then resell it on a possible changed market at the end of their tour. I am firmly convinced that the Air Force owes it to its people to protect them against such requirements. If any of you have any ideas on housing, please contact me or Colonel O'Connor, the local base commander. We will certainly cooperate with you to the maximum extent.

When I observe the activities of your community, I cannot help but note the progress you have made in the civilian defense field. Since the Ground Observer Corps is an important augmentation of our air defense activities, I want to pay special tribute to those of you who have and are contributing to this program. Such a program, especially in this area, is a valuable augmentation to our air defense capability.

Before I close I want to make one other observation. I have been a businessman all of my life. It has never been my privilege to associate closely with military men until these last 2 years. However, I have never associated with a finer body of men than those who make up your Armed Forces. They come from every walk of life just as you and

I do. On them we have placed great responsibility for our security which demands that they be ready for war at any moment of the day or night, year after year. It is a great strain on them. They have dedicated themselves to this life willingly and are doing a tremendous job for us. They are men of whom we should be justly proud. I would encourage all of you to express your appreciation and understanding for the job they are doing. Your encouragement will mean much to them.

I want to thank all of you from Presque Isle and from the surrounding communities for the friendship you have shown to our Air Force family. I know that it has taken many adjustments to align yourselves to the presence of a large group of men in uniform and their families in your community. I know that you have enlarged your schools, absorbed our men into your churches, and welcomed them into your community life. From all I have seen you have done well, and I think both the military and the civilian community are enjoying a better life because of your associations.

Thank you.

#### IMPORTANCE OF A BIPARTISAN UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, one of the saddest reflections we can make on the Yalta disclosures is the realization that the Wilsonian ideal of "open covenants openly arrived at" is just as remote today as it was in 1918. The Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran conferences were about as partisan as they could be, on the American side. Mr. Atlee was taken along to Potsdam by the British, who anticipated the possibility of Mr. Churchill's defeat at that time. But if any Republicans were within gunshot of Yalta, Potsdam, or Teheran, they must have sneaked through the barbed wire.

Certainly, by this time in our history, we should know that everything comes out in the long run. Today's newsmen have made that long run much shorter than it used to be. Their ability to dig out the news is phenomenal; and secrets, whether they be labeled top, middle, or bottom, do not remain secrets very long.

In the light of these facts, it ought to be elementary—and mandatory—that both political parties be represented by high-ranking members at every international conference. Our foreign policy can become truly bipartisan only when this happens.

#### FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY BILL, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 67) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I call up my amendments 3/23/55-B, and ask that they be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Virginia to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, beginning with line 11, it is proposed to strike out through line 2, on page 20.

On page 22, beginning with line 13, to strike out through line 19, on page 24, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 9. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of its enactment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, these are the same amendments that were agreed to when offered to the postal employees' pay bill. They make the effective date of the bill the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I accept the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, offered by the senior Senator from Virginia to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, may I inquire what the parliamentary situation is, and what action was taken on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my attention was distracted, and I did not hear the President pro tempore put the question on the committee amendment as amended. I have been waiting to offer an amendment. I ask now for the reconsideration of the action taken on the committee amendment, so that an amendment I have discussed with the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service can be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

On page 21, after line 8, insert the following new subsections:

"(h) (1) The provisions under the heading 'Increased Pay for Legislative Employees' in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, section 2 (a) of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), and section 4 (a) of this act are hereby amended by striking out '(other than an employee in the office of a Senator).'

"(2) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator on the effective date of this subsection is hereby adjusted to the lowest multiple of \$60 which will provide basic compensation, plus additional compensation payable under subsection (a) and the provisions of law referred to in subsection (a), not less than the amount of basic compensation, plus additional compensation under the provisions of sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and

section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees' Salary Act of 1948, which he is receiving on the effective date of this subsection.

"(i) The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the office of each Senator shall be the amount authorized under provisions of law in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this act for Senators from States the population of which is less than 3,000,000 increased as follows:

	Amount of increase
"States having a population of: Less than 3,000,000-----	\$6,000
3,000,000 but less than 4,000,000-----	9,000
4,000,000 but less than 5,000,000-----	12,000
5,000,000 but less than 7,000,000-----	15,000
7,000,000 but less than 9,000,000-----	18,000
9,000,000 but less than 11,000,000-----	21,000
11,000,000 but less than 12,000,000-----	24,000
Over 13,000,000-----	27,000"

On page 22, line 13, after "act", insert "except subsections (h) and (i) of section 4."

On page 22, after the period in line 17, insert a new sentence, as follows:

"Subsections (h) and (i) of section 4 shall become effective on July 1, 1955."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I am not disposed to discuss it at length at this time, but I should merely like to say that it is an effort to iron out the differences which exist between the House and the Senate with reference to legislative employees, the ceilings which have been imposed on employees, and other difficulties, and, in addition thereto, the allocation of clerical assistance on the basis which presently obtains, which provides for a certain amount for States having a population less than 3 million, another for States having a population from 3 to 5 million, another for States having a population up to 10 million, and another for States having a population of over 10 million.

For a number of years there has been considerable discussion about the inequities involved in this arrangement. I respectfully request the chairman of the committee to take my amendment to conference. It may need a little more explanation than could be made on the Senate floor. The amendment has had a great deal of attention on the part of committee staffs and senatorial assistants in senatorial offices. I think 7 or 8 Senators have cosponsored the amendment, which indicates some interest in it. If the distinguished chairman of the committee will take the amendment to conference, I am quite sure, if difficulties are involved, they can be ironed out. The amendment is a little complicated, and difficult to explain.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this matter has been before the committee and has been discussed. As the Senator from Illinois knows, there is a variance of opinion in the Senate. Some Senators oppose and others favor what the Senator has proposed in his amendment. I am sure members of the committee know what I am talking about at the present time. At the same time, however, there are some inequities which should be corrected. I shall be glad to take the amendment to

conference, but I wish the Senator to know the amendment will be taken to conference for the purpose of study, and that the committee will be under no obligation to insist on its being adopted, or any part of it.

I think the ceilings should be lifted on the compensation of a number of assistants in Senators' offices. Some Senators desire to have two assistants in their offices. However, the matter should be studied, and for that reason, and that reason only, I am perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference. I am not saying that the committee will stand in favor of it. I do not say what I shall do.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I realize the need for additional clerical assistants for Senators who come from the larger States and I am of the opinion that, after study and under proper conditions, Senators should have a right to organize their own offices, within the allowances they receive, and compensate their employees in a proper manner.

What worries me about the bill as reported by the committee is that the bill now deals with every employee in the classified service alike. It provides for a 10-percent across-the-board pay increase, without giving any particular or special emphasis to salary increases for employees of the legislative branch.

Frankly, I think the proposal of the Senator from Illinois has merit. However, we are considering basic pay increases for classified employees. Without further consideration of the picture of congressional needs, I would not want anyone to get the idea that we are doing for our own employees what we are refusing to do for the million and a half classified workers.

I think the morale of the classified employees is important. If classified employees can see that they are being treated on a share and share alike basis, it will be a great morale factor; whereas if we raise the limits on legislative committee staffs and employees alone, it may not be considered equitable.

If we raise the allowance for administrative assistants, I believe we might be accused of doing more for ourselves in this bill than we are willing to do for employees in the classified service. I think this matter may well be met by permitting Senators to rearrange pay scales. If they need two top men of equal competence, the legislative subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations will be able to take care of that need. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who served, so ably in the reorganization of Congress, that before we give carte blanche to Senators to grant raises to their employees and committee staffs, I think the Senate should make a study to see if we cannot arrange to have the staff directors of committees compensated at the highest level under the civil service system if we wish, so that they, as the ones in charge of the operation of the committees, could have a \$14,800 annual salary, while the other staff experts could enjoy the 10 percent increase which is provided in the bill, and which I believe would bring their salaries up to a sum in the neighborhood of \$12,800 annually.

I feel that to do that in this bill would destroy the uniformity of the bill. Although I do not wish to see us foreclosed in any degree from acting in accordance with the need to adjust this matter to fit the requirements of various Senators, in view of the workload imposed upon them because of the populations of their States, I do not believe it is wise to have two different sets of pay increases provided in the same bill.

So far as concerns taking the amendment to conference, let me say we know that if we take it to conference, the conferees on the part of the House will not raise a single question as to the pay of the Senate staffs, for the question of pay for employees of the respective Houses is a matter which historically has been left to each House to determine.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, let me say that I have just learned that the amendment does not cover committee staff employees.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I had before me a copy of the printed Dirksen amendment, but of course the amendment was not read in full. I have been referring to the printed amendment which I presumed we were discussing. However, I now understand that the amendment increases only the amount available for Senators from the larger States, and that the amendment is limited to that one item.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct; the amendment has nothing to do with the salaries paid to a Senator's staff.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then that completely eliminates any question I had in mind. I knew the printed amendment had been placed on the desks of Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly I shall be delighted to consider the amendment in conference, because, coming as I do from a State with a smaller population, I realize that the demands on my office staff are insignificant as compared with the demands on the office staffs of Senators who represent the States with large populations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Illinois, or some other Senator: Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], on behalf of himself and certain other Senators, there will simply be an increase in the allowance for the offices of Senators, graduated according to the population of the States, and without any change in the limitation which now is imposed as to the maximum which can be paid to staff members; is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; the amendment includes a provision repealing the language of existing law so as to place them on the same basis as everyone else. That is one of the things to which the Senator from South Carolina took some objection. I said I was not wedded to it, as such, and consequently he can take it to conference and can work his will upon it. But, of course, the important thing is the allocations as between the various States. That matter has been pending year after year before the Ap-



propriations Committee, and I thought that somewhere along the line it should be adjusted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I recognize the difficulty, and I wanted to have clearly in mind the limitation on the maximum amount we can pay our help. For instance, under existing law our administrative assistant is payable at the maximum amount of \$11,646, I believe; that is the gross pay. Our chief secretary can be paid at the rate of approximately \$10,646, or something of the sort. Does this amendment maintain that differential; or does it remove that limitation, and make the limitation that which is applicable to the classified employees generally?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This amendment includes a provision which would virtually repeal that limitation, and would permit each Member of the Senate to determine the matter for himself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then the ceiling would be that within the classified service, would it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. But I indicated to the Senator from South Carolina that I had no particular pride of authorship, and that it was a matter they could determine, if they so desired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think there should be some limitation in the case of each office.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, perhaps some amplification of this proposal is desirable, although I was not inclined to delay Senate action on the bill now pending.

The amendment in question actually deals with three matters. The first is the amount which a Senator can pay to members of his staff. The bill places a ceiling of \$12,810 as against \$11,646, which is the present ceiling. However, under existing law salaries are divided into 3 categories and the top amount can be paid to only 1 person. By repealing the portion beginning in line 7 on page 19 and down through line 10, this would permit a Member of the Senate to set ceiling for any of his employees within the ceilings provided by the bill.

The second part of the amendment makes possible the use of the so-called blue table in calculating salaries for members employed in senatorial offices. At the present time two tables are used in calculating compensation. The blue table is used for all employees other than those in offices of Senators and the white table only for employees in senatorial offices. There is a substantial difference in the two tables, but the use of the blue table to calculate total compensation will make it possible for Senators to pay compensation now in effect at a lower base.

Perhaps an example will suffice. The blue table which applies to all except employees in senatorial offices for a base of \$5,100 per year would provide total compensation of \$8,644. This would be applicable to all Senate employees except those in senatorial offices. The white table for a base of \$5,100 would provide total compensation of only \$7,484.07. If, therefore, the present salary level in the office of a Senator were maintained, the base amount would be reduced accordingly and out of it he could add to his staff if he so desired.

The third part of the amendment deals with allocation of the aggregate amount which is available, depending on the population of the State. There has been considerable interest in this matter because of the disparities which now exist. As an example, the State of Nevada, with a population of 218,000 as of July 1, 1954, is entitled for each senator to a basic clerk hire allowance of \$42,240. This spells out to a little more than 19 cents per capita. Then consider the State of Ohio, with a population of 8,554,000, for which the basic clerk hire allowance is \$55,740. This spells out to \$0.006 per capita. This means that in the case of Nevada the allowance is 31 times more per capita than in the case of Ohio. Other large States are similarly circumstanced. This matter has been under discussion for a long time, and the amendment suggested would establish an increased base for States with a population of less than 3 million, and then increase the amount for each million jump in population until a population of 5 million is reached. After that it jumps on the basis of an increase of each 2 million of population.

The bill as it came from the committee increase these allowances somewhat, but did not change the formula to eliminate the disparities and make it more equitable. Moreover, if the proposal submitted in this amendment is adopted it will become effective only after July 1, 1955, and would replace the provisions now carried in the bill.

So to summarize, the amendment in effect does increase clerk hire funds without requiring that any Senator spend them if he does not need them; makes every Senator the sole judge of the number of employees on his roll and their rate of compensation except that the limit carried in the bill is preserved; makes possible the use of the blue table instead of the present white table in determining actual compensation per annum; and finally, would change the present formula with respect to the aggregate amount of clerk hire made available to each Senator and eliminates the inequities in the formula.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not quite oriented as to the meaning of the amendment. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, it would raise the ceiling in the case of the lump sum allowed to each senatorial office. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Then each Senator would be allowed to determine what he would pay his secretary, so long as he did not exceed the present ceiling. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have no objection to that provision, and I thank the chairman of the committee for the explanation. Let me say that he has a fine committee which renders excellent service and gives great help not only to the Government employees in Washington and throughout the Nation, but also to the Members of the Senate.

I would not want any Senator to have classified employees in his office. I

would be willing to have the individual Senator allowed to determine whom he thinks can best serve him, irrespective of classification, so long as he is allowed to give a certain amount of pay.

Mr. President, I should like to discuss one other matter. Although it cannot be taken care of at this time, I hope it will be properly taken care of in the future. We worry about the salaries of senatorial staff members or committee staff members. Such staff members are here by the hundreds; they are practically in each other's way. Possibly we also worry about our administrative assistants, although generally they can take care of themselves.

However, we worry very little about the employees who actually do the work; we give very little thought either to their salaries or to their other working conditions. I hope that sometime the committee will give attention to that matter. I shall take it up in the Appropriations Committee when the bill comes before the committee.

In short, Mr. President, what Senator does not take 1, 2, or 3 of his clerical help to his home State, to work there during the summer? Do we ever stop to think that, with the small wages they are receiving, they have to pay their railroad fare, and they may have to get new homes?

I wish there were now in the bill some provision to take care of that situation. Although I would not wish to interfere with the handling of this bill, legislatively, for I wish the bill to proceed in the way the committee desires to have it proceed, so as to provide an increase in the salaries of Federal employees in Washington and elsewhere, yet I hope that at least we can take care of the railroad fare or the bus fare of some poor girl who is getting a small salary. We should give some consideration to the status of those employees, rather than be worried so constantly about the salaries of the so-called experts. The average committee is loaded with so-called experts who have very little work to do. But the employees who do the work in our home States do not even receive their railroad fare, much less a proper salary.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. Certainly we must give consideration to the point he has raised. All of us realize that when we return to our home States, we must have a secretary there; but no provision whatever is made for paying that secretary's transportation to and from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer a perfecting amendment to correct a typographical error, on page 13, in the last column of the tables appearing after line 2, to strike out "\$2,030" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,030."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, in the committee amendment, in the last column of the table appearing after line 2, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,030" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,030."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the language proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire to have the amend-

ment to the amendment read at this time?

Mr. CARLSON. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment offered by Mr. CARLSON in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the committee, as amended, is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Pay Act of 1955.'

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

		Per annum rates					
"Grade							
GS-1	\$2,645	\$2,725	\$2,805	\$2,885	\$2,965	\$3,045	\$3,125
GS-2	2,915	2,995	3,075	3,155	3,235	3,315	3,395
GS-3	3,130	3,210	3,290	3,370	3,450	3,530	3,610
GS-4	3,365	3,445	3,525	3,605	3,685	3,765	3,845
GS-5	3,615	3,740	3,865	3,990	4,115	4,240	4,365
GS-6	4,025	4,150	4,275	4,400	4,525	4,650	4,775
GS-7	4,460	4,585	4,710	4,835	4,960	5,085	5,210
GS-8	4,900	5,025	5,150	5,275	5,400	5,525	5,650
GS-9	5,365	5,490	5,615	5,740	5,865	5,990	6,115
GS-10	5,830	5,955	6,080	6,205	6,330	6,455	6,580
GS-11	6,295	6,495	6,695	6,895	7,095	7,295	
GS-12	7,465	7,665	7,865	8,065	8,265	8,465	
GS-13	8,860	9,060	9,260	9,460	9,660	9,860	
GS-14	10,175	10,375	10,575	10,775	10,975	11,175	
GS-15	11,450	11,700	11,950	12,200	12,450		
GS-16	12,720	12,920	13,120	13,320	13,520		
GS-17	13,780	13,980	14,180	14,380	14,580		
GS-18	14,800						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

		Per annum rates					
"Grade							
CPC-1	\$1,920	\$1,980	\$2,040	\$2,100	\$2,160	\$2,220	\$2,280
CPC-2	2,565	2,635	2,705	2,775	2,845	2,915	2,985
CPC-3	2,707	2,787	2,867	2,947	3,027	3,107	3,187
CPC-4	2,915	2,995	3,075	3,155	3,235	3,315	3,395
CPC-5	3,154	3,234	3,314	3,394	3,474	3,554	3,634
CPC-6	3,390	3,470	3,550	3,630	3,710	3,790	3,870
CPC-7	3,640	3,740	3,840	3,940	4,040	4,140	4,240
CPC-8	3,965	4,090	4,215	4,340	4,465	4,590	4,715
CPC-9	4,400	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900	5,025	5,150
CPC-10	4,840	4,965	5,090	5,215	5,340	5,465	5,590

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,845 per annum, and head charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,985 per annum."

"(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the General Schedule or the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date;

"(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between 2 scheduled or 2 longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the General Schedule or the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date;

"(3) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is in a position in any 1 of the first 15 grades of the General Schedule or any 1 of the grades of the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule and is receiving basic compensation at a rate which is in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade at such time, (A) he shall receive basic compensation at the maximum longevity rate of his grade as provided in this section or (B) if the rate of basic compensation which he

is receiving immediately prior to the effective date of this section is higher than the maximum longevity rate of his grade as provided in this section, he shall continue to receive such higher rate of basic compensation until (i) he leaves such position or (ii) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended; or

"(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is in a position in grade 16 or 17 of the General Schedule and is receiving basic compensation at a rate which is in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade at such time, (A) he shall receive basic compensation at the maximum scheduled rate of his grade as provided in this section, or (B) if the rate of basic compensation which he is receiving immediately prior to the effective date of this section is higher than the maximum scheduled rate of his grade as provided in this section, he shall continue to receive such higher rate of basic compensation until (i) he leaves such position or (ii) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended.

"(c) Each officer or employee (1) who, on the effective date of this section, is in a position which has been transferred prior to such effective date pursuant to title I of

the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), to one of the classes of positions described in section 202 (7) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or, on such effective date, is in another position in one of such classes, (2) who, at the time of such transfer, held such position so transferred and, at all times subsequent to such transfer, either held such transferred position or held another position in one of such classes, or both, and (3) whose rate of basic compensation is less on the effective date of this section than the rate to which he would have been entitled on such effective date if such transfer had not occurred (unless he is receiving such lesser rate by reason of an adverse personnel action resulting from his own fault), shall be paid basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he would have been receiving on such effective date (including compensation for each within-grade and longevity step-increase which he would have earned) if such transfer had not occurred until the date immediately following such effective date, until (A) he leaves the position which he holds on such effective date, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate under the prevailing wage policy system; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such prevailing wage policy system.

"Sec. 3. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C., sec. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (a) (5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by section 2 of this act in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) The limitations of \$10,560 and \$14,355 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the paragraph under the heading "Salaries of Supporting Personnel" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1955, or in any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

"Sec. 4. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 6 percent of the aggregate rate of his rate of basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, the provisions under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, and the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.). The additional compensation provided for by this subsection shall not be taken into account in determining whether any amount expended for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service is within any limit now prescribed by law.

"(b) Section 2 (b) of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), is amended by striking out "\$11,646" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,345".

"(c) The rates of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the



Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 6 percent.

"(d) The limitations in the paragraph designated 'Folding documents' under the heading 'Contingent expenses of the House' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 470, 83d Cong.), are hereby increased by 6 percent.

"Sec. 5. Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives or of any Production Credit Corporation, Production Credit Association, or Bank for Cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of \$14,580 per annum."

"Sec. 6. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by the act of January 3, 1946 (Public Law 293, 79th Cong.), as amended, are hereby increased by 6 percent.

"(b) Section 8 (d) of such act of January 3, 1946 (Public Law 293, 79th Cong.), as amended, is amended by striking out '\$12,800' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$13,520'.

"Sec. 7. (a) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C., sec. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on or after the effective date of this act, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this act for corresponding rates of compensation.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

"Sec. 8. The rates of basic compensation provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 6 percent.

"Sec. 9. This act shall take effect on the 1st day of the 1st pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I shall not consume any great length of time. I should like to speak for 2 or 3 minutes on the substitute which I have offered. It provides for an average 6 percent across-the-board increase for classified workers of the Federal Government. It would affect one and a half million of them, and it would cost approximately \$240 million. It is consistent with the substitute which I offered to S. 1.

I do not see the need of debating the issue at this time. The Senate has acted on one bill providing salary increases. I offer this amendment for the record. I shall vote for it, but I fully appreciate the sentiment of the Senate on this issue. I am therefore ready to vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in the nature of a substitute for the language proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. MONRONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the Carlson substitute on the basis of the Senate's action with regard to postal workers. The Senate has voted to give them an increase of approximately 10 percent, to which they are entitled, of course. There are approximately a million and a half classified workers in the Government.

It has been the custom and the tradition to carry forward pay increases on as uniform basis as possible. To do otherwise would lead to a great disparity between these groups of workers. What the Senate has done is to give the postal workers a 10 percent increase. To pass the Carlson substitute would give the classified workers 4 percent less.

I see no justification for treating one group of employees one way and another group of employees another way. There are approximately 600,000 employees in the Post Office Department, and about a million and a half classified employees. The committee has worked hard to maintain uniformity between these two pay scales. I urge the Senate not to approve the Carlson substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], in the nature of a substitute for the language proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in order to conserve time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement I have prepared on the bill S. 67.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

I appreciate greatly this opportunity to discuss with the Members of the Senate the bill (S. 67) which was approved recently by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1955 (S. 67) is the companion to the postal-pay bill (S. 1) acted upon recently by the Senate and is designed to provide an increase in pay of approximately 10 percent, but not less than \$200—with a few minor exceptions—to the over 1 million employees in the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government.

The bill covers, among others, scientific, professional, administrative, and clerical personnel in all three branches of the Government. Less than 20 percent of these employees work in the Washington area, while over 80 percent work in every State of the Union and many distant outposts of the world.

The bill extends to these employees increases in rates of basic compensation comparable to those the Senate just voted the

half million postal employees. Similarly, the raises are retroactive to the first pay period commencing in 1955, and the ceiling of \$14,800 above which no salary may be raised is maintained.

An increase in pay for these employees has been recommended by the administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Service Commission. The committee listened to representatives of employee organizations, many individual employees, and a number of private citizens plead for early and favorable action in this matter. The committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is of the belief that prompt enactment of S. 67 is appropriate and well justified.

Many of us are well aware of the vast sums of money required to carry out the various programs and perform the multitude of essential functions of our Federal Government. For my part, I am ever on the alert for ways of reducing these large expenditures when it can be done through the curtailment of waste and inefficiency or through the elimination of useless giveaway programs and other completely nonessential activities. By such steps we can accomplish real economy and worthwhile reductions in the Federal budget. In spite of my awareness of costs, I do not believe it is a good management practice to use the size of the budget as a weight to hold down the salaries of the rank and file of our Federal employees below a justifiable and decent level.

While on the subject of costs, it should be noted that the committee was neither impressed nor helped by the accuracy, quality, or timeliness of the Civil Service Commission's report on this bill. Of even greater significance is the fact that the report has the appearance of being worded in a manner designed to deliberately deceive the Congress in its consideration of this important measure.

As an example, the second sentence in the third paragraph of the Commission report states, "We estimate that these increases would cost the Government about \$506,305,000 annually." The next paragraph states, "To this extremely high cost of \$506 million must be added upward of \$194 million to cover the retroactive period from August 23, 1954, to the date of enactment, thus, S. 67 would cost \$700 million \* \* \*."

I ask, if the cost is \$506 million annually, as indicated by the Commission, would not the cost from August 23, 1954, through June 30, 1955—a period of 10 months plus—amount to ten-twelfths of \$506 million, or \$425 million instead of the \$700 million claimed by the Commission? The report contains other statements equally misleading, devoid of fact, and obviously warped against S. 67 in favor of the administration's proposal. In this instance, as it turns out, the figures referred to no longer have any real significance for the reason that S. 1 as reported differs in many respects from the bill upon which the Commission commented. What is important and disturbing is that the Commission would trifle so with the facts. Surely, the Congress is entitled to expect accurate and reliable reports from the Civil Service Commission on matters of this kind.

I believe the raises provided in S. 67 are justified. I believe S. 67 is a good bill and should be enacted promptly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point several editorials dealing with the administration's highway program.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of January 17, 1955]

#### HIGHWAY FINANCE PLAN SUBJECT TO QUESTION

President Eisenhower has yet to submit to Congress the administration's specific recommendations on the proposed multi-billion-dollar program to bring America's highways up to date.

But if the suggestions advanced by a special study commission headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay are accepted, the financial aspects of this plan are certainly subject to question on the part of everyone who is concerned with the Government's fiscal stability and the vast public debt.

In brief, this plan calls for the Federal Government to raise about \$20 billion of the total estimated cost of \$101 billion by floating bonds, but the debt to be incurred would not be recognized in the Federal budget and would not be classed as a part of the total Federal debt.

Last week, Senator HARRY BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, raised his voice in opposition to the idea. He said it would "destroy the budget and the Federal debt limitation."

"If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything," BYRD said. His main criticism was based on the fact the Government would not own the assets and would have no security behind the highway bonds, aside from the anticipated revenue from the Federal gas tax.

There have been various plans put forward for trick Federal financing of various needed projects. Some of these look good on the surface. But when a man like Senator BYRD adds a word of warning against such devices for the Government to fool itself and invite inflation and possible repudiation of all debts, that word of warning is worth some heed.

[From the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News of January 21, 1955]

#### BYRD QUESTION WORTH CONSIDERATION

Alluring as is the prospect of all of those roads envisioned in the administration's hundred-billion-dollar highway program, thoughtful minds cannot dismiss lightly the objections to the financing plan raised by Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia.

As projected by Gen. Lucius Clay, Chairman of the Commission which worked up the program, the Government, in addition to the money regularly spent in Federal road aid to the States, would provide \$25 billion for an interstate network of highways. The money for this would come from revenue bonds to be financed by the present 2-cent Federal gasoline tax, and rental fees from filling stations, motels, etc., along the new highways. The whole thing would be handled by a Federal highway corporation, thus taking the operation outside the regular Federal budget.

BYRD's objection is based not only on his assertion that every dollar spent in this manner would cost the taxpayers 55 cents in interest, but on the argument that to take this step would destroy the Federal budget. As BYRD expresses it, "If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything. This corporation

would not own any roads or have any assets."

As an alternative, BYRD proposes that Congress reduce the gasoline tax from 2 cents to one-half cent, thus giving the States an opportunity to increase their road revenues without increasing the overall load of the automobile driver. Regular Federal aid to the States he would finance with the half-cent gasoline tax and the present lubricating oil levy.

What Senator BYRD says about the evils of the revenue-bond approach, and the danger inherent in the precedent of undertaking public financing outside the budget, commands itself at once to the cautious mind. It will take a lot of persuading to convince conservative-minded Congressmen of the wisdom of such a course.

On the other hand, the Senator's proposal would seem to fall short of the need. The News always has adhered to the doctrine that the Federal Government should keep hands off State affairs. For that reason it has opposed in principle the grants-in-aid device. To the extent, therefore, that the Byrd plan would return to the States more taxing potentiality without increasing the public burden, it is, the News believes, a step in the right direction. Apparently, however, he does not propose to change the existing Federal-State relationship. The Government would continue collecting and distributing among the States money for roads which have no important relationship to interstate commerce. His proposal would be sounder, we think, were it to contemplate use of all Federal money, whatever its source, for purely interstate highways.

If the Federal Government has any proper place in the road picture, it is in the interstate phase of it. Therefore, if the interstate network envisioned in the Clay program can be financed without resort to revenue bonds, it probably should be undertaken, even if that means complete abandonment of the present policy of sending Federal road money into the States to be spent on a matching basis.

[From the Point Pleasant (W. Va.) Register of January 24, 1955]

#### A TIMELY WARNING

Alluring as is the prospect of all of those roads envisioned in the administration's hundred-billion-dollar highway program, thoughtful minds cannot dismiss lightly the objections to the financing plan raised by Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia.

As projected by Gen. Lucius Clay, Chairman of the Commission, which worked up the program, the Government, in addition to the money regularly spent in Federal road aid to the States, would provide \$25 billion for an interstate network of highways. The money for this would come from revenue bonds to be financed by the present 2-cent Federal gasoline tax, and rental fees from filling stations, motels, etc., along the new highways. The whole thing would be handled by a Federal highway corporation thus taking the operation outside the regular Federal budget.

BYRD's objection is based, not only on his assertion that every dollar spent in this manner would cost the taxpayers 55 cents in interest, but on the argument that to take this step would destroy the Federal budget. As BYRD expresses it, "If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything. This corporation would not own any roads or have any assets."

As an alternative, BYRD proposes that Congress reduce the gasoline tax from 2 cents to one-half cent, thus giving the States an opportunity to increase their road revenues without increasing the overall load of the automobile driver. Regular Federal aid to the States he would finance with the half-

cent gasoline tax and the present lubricating-oil levy.

What Senator BYRD says about the evils of the revenue-bond approach, and the danger inherent in the precedent of undertaking public financing outside the budget, commands itself at once to the cautious mind. It will take a lot of persuading to convince conservative-minded Congressmen of the wisdom of such a course.

On the other hand, the Senator's proposal would seem to fall short of the need. This newspaper always has adhered to the doctrine that the Federal Government should keep hands off State affairs. For that reason it has opposed in principle the grants-in-aid device. To the extent, therefore, that the Byrd plan would return to the States more taxing potentiality without increasing the public burden, it is, this newspaper believes, a step in the right direction. Apparently, however, he does not propose to change the existing Federal-State relationship. The Government would continue collecting and distributing among the States money for roads which have no important relationship to interstate commerce. His proposal would be sounder, we think, were it to contemplate use of all Federal money, whatever its source, for purely interstate highways.

If the Federal Government has any proper place in the road picture, it is in the interstate phase of it. Therefore, if the interstate network envisioned in the Clay program can be financed without resort to revenue bonds, it probably should be undertaken, even if that means complete abandonment of the present policy of sending Federal road money into the States to be spent on a matching basis.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News of January 24, 1955]

#### GRANTS-IN-AID

In connection with his criticism of the administration's multibillion dollar road program, Virginia's Senator BYRD calls attention to a phase of Federal-State relationship which has been getting more and more out of hand.

Digging into the statistics, Senator BYRD learned that as recently as 1934, the Federal Government's total distribution of so-called grants-in-aid money among the States amounted to but \$126 million. It covered 18 activities. Today, the distribution amounts to \$3 billion and covers 50 programs. And there is constant pressure on Congress for more projects and more aid.

"Every Federal grant," Senator BYRD emphasizes, "elevates the control of the Federal Government and subordinates the authority of the States. Nothing is truer than the rule that power follows the purse. When the Federal Government makes a grant it directs the exact manner in which the fund is expended, even though the expenditure is partly contributed by the States. Time and time again I have seen the iron hand of the Federal bureaucracy compel the States to do things that they did not desire to do, because of grants made by the Federal Government."

With respect to the road program, instead of using the proceeds of the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax to carry a big issue of revenue bonds, Senator BYRD would cut the tax to one-half of 1 percent thus releasing more taxing power to the States to finance their own road programs.

Whether or not one agrees with Senator BYRD's objections to this particular activity in view of the road needs of the day, the commonsense of what he says about grants-in-aid is apparent. It always has seemed to this newspaper that the Federal Government could and should participate in the development of purely interstate roads without bringing into play the principle of grants-in-aid at all. We think it proper, in the light



of the requirements of interstate transportation, that the Federal Government concern itself with interstate highway construction and maintenance. We think it improper that Federal money be used, on a matching basis or otherwise, to stimulate purely intrastate road development which has nothing more than an indirect influence on interstate movements.

[From the Kenosha (Wis.) News of January 17, 1955]

#### UNIQUE HIGHWAY FINANCING

A highway modernization program costing billions of dollars will be proposed by the President to Congress later this month.

Hungry as we all are for better roads, if the new plan is based closely on the recommendations of the Clay Commission it should be given close scrutiny. Spending watchdog Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, takes a dim view of the unique method of financing proposed.

The committee recommends borrowing \$20 billion at 3 percent interest to finance one portion of the vast undertaking, specifically the construction of 40,000 road miles to be known as interstate highway. At the rate of interest every dollar borrowed would cost taxpayers \$1.55, Senator BYRD reports, if paid off on schedule.

The Senator comments: "Based on all recent Federal experience, I submit it is a violent assumption to predict these bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years. Continuing increase in the Federal debt is in prospect for an indefinite period."

The committee recommended to the President that the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow \$20 billion from the public. The Treasury would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt, Senator BYRD points out, would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States.

And here's the danger as outlined pointedly by the Virginia Democrat: "If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc."

In brief, the Government would be operating with two sets of books, one set for activities financed by borrowing outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and under budget control.

The commission's proposal looks like an easy way to add to our national financial woes. It reeks of fiscal confusion and disorder. Before accepting anything of this nature, Congress should give thought to less evasive methods of financing, for the program itself is designed to meet a real need which must be satisfied immediately. Better roads are important, but it is doubtful if a separate debt structure should be created to provide them. There must be other, saner means.

[From the Marshfield (Wis.) News-Herald of January 20, 1955]

#### BYRD'S HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Will someone please come forward and shoot holes in Senator BYRD's arguments against the multi-billion-dollar national highway construction program recommended to President Eisenhower by the National Advisory Committee? We confess we cannot and, on the contrary, are bound to go along with the Virginia Senator's substitute proposals.

To begin with, Senator BYRD, the Senate's financial watchdog who hates debt and def-

cits, believes strongly in the need for a stepped-up highway construction program. He sees highways wearing out and becoming obsolete as motor-vehicle registrations increase year after year. But he would have the States do their own financing; he would remove the Federal Government as the financing agent.

The Virginian's method is simple: He would have the Federal Government repeal the present 2-cent gasoline tax and have the States reimpose this tax. (2) He would continue the present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems which has been integrated with State highway systems on a matching basis. This amounts to \$535 million. (3) He would continue the present Federal lubricating-oil tax. (4) He would levy a one-half-cent per gallon Federal gasoline tax. Revenue from this and the lubricating-oil tax would be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

In this financing program, no money would be borrowed, as is contemplated by the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee to the President. Senator BYRD points out that "if the 30-year taxable bonds recommended by the committee can be sold at 3 percent interest, and if they are paid off on schedule—the last maturing in 1987—the interest would cost more than \$11.5 billion. At this rate every dollar borrowed would cost the taxpayers \$1.55."

A lot of highway mileage can be constructed with \$11.5 billion.

The Senator points out some extremely pertinent facts:

1. It is a violent assumption to predict that these (the proposed) bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, he says, we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years. Continuing increase in the Federal debt is in prospect for an indefinite period.

2. With continual population shifts, there is a constant shifting of road needs; there is no such thing as a permanent road because no one can predict in advance what specific roads will carry the most traffic. Hence, it would be unwise to expend huge sums in road construction in the next couple of years; the safer course is to increase the annual construction program in each of the 48 States, with the States doing the financing.

3. The proposed Federal corporation to assume the debt and financing responsibility is unsound and dangerous because it permits the Federal Government to go into debt beyond its legal limit. If such bypassing of the law is permitted for road building, similar means will be found for financing endless outlays for education, hospitals, public health, etc.

4. There is grave danger that the iron hand of Federal bureaucracy may compel the States to do things that they do not desire but feel they must enter into because of grants-in-aid. Many States now are finding difficulty in meeting their budgets; so violent a program as that proposed by the National Advisory Committee may be beyond many States' ability to cope with. In this respect, we think Wisconsin is eyeing askance the proposed highway building program.

We find ourselves agreeing with Senator BYRD in his declaration that the procedure proposed to the President by the Advisory Committee violates financing principles, defies budgetary control, and evades Federal debt law.

Ever since the profligate New Deal began squandering money from the National Treasury, the Virginia Senator has been in opposition. His has been one of the few voices raised in objection. The American people have become accustomed to his opposition and many think of him as the voice which cried "Wolf, wolf." For lo, these many years, this profligacy has proceeded. The Eisenhower administration has simply carried

along the New Deal program. Americans, generally, are fearful of both inflation and deflation but, of the two, they prefer inflation. In this instance, we suspect the average American is willing to see the country push its luck to the extreme by entering into the highway construction program; and, if necessary, to finance it by borrowing rather than by adopting the plan proposed by Senator BYRD.

We hope Senator BYRD's leadership is accepted by the Congress when this proposal comes up for consideration. Our Wisconsin contingent would do well to examine his reasons for opposing the committee. He does well to offer an alternate scheme. This fact adds strength to his arguments against the proposals of President Eisenhower.

[From the Danville (Va.) Register of January 16, 1955]

#### BYRD ON HIGHWAY BUILDING

The opening lines from the ballad, *The Wreck of Old 97*, come to mind after reading Senator BYRD's comments on the report of the Clay Commission on Interstate Highways. The condition of the Southern's road-bed between Lynchburg and Danville in 1903 was described as "mighty rough" and that is the condition of the legislative road Mr. Eisenhower's Federal roads plan must follow in the Democratic Congress.

The Virginia senior Senator was simply devastating in his rendering of the Clay Commission recommendations, and his promise to "discuss the new road plan at length when the President submits it to Congress on January 27" suggests that his treatment of the Clay report is but a starter.

Briefly, the Clay report proposed: (1) That existing Federal aid to highways (\$623 million a year) be continued; (2) Federal expenditures of an additional \$25 billion be made over a period of 10 years in construction of 40,000 miles of designated interstate highways.

What aroused Senator BYRD most is the financing plan. A Federal corporation, as he notes, without assets or income, would issue bonds guaranteed by the United States Treasury but not made an obligation of the United States, so that it would not count in exceeding the statutory limit.

BYRD insists the plan violates financing principles, defies budgetary control, and evades the Federal-debt law. If that were not enough to provoke a charge of dishonesty in bookkeeping, the Senator pours on more criticism of the procedures and adds the final clincher that the plan would cost the taxpayers \$1.55 for every dollar borrowed.

Not one to criticize without offering something better, Senator BYRD proposed a four-step plan to build more mileage at a considerably smaller cost which will not increase Federal debt and will leave the States with the same control over their highways as they now have. The Byrd plan, set forth in the news columns, deserves the attention of President Eisenhower before he submits a highway message embodying the Clay Commission recommendations. It also deserves, and probably will receive, the close scrutiny of Members of the Congress.

[From the Harrisonburg (Va.) News-Record of January 21, 1955]

#### WHAT OTHER EDITORS SAY

##### BYRD'S BROADSIDE (Lynchburg News)

The opposition of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, to the proposed expenditure of billions of dollars for a Federal system of highways is both economic and political. It is based in his considered ideas of what constitutes sane fiscal policy and in his long-held philosophy of government. None of it is partisan in motivation. Though in accord

with principles long held by the Democratic Party his views in this instant may be shared by the fiscally conservative of both major parties.

The political objection to the Clay Commission's proposal, which is endorsed in principle by the Eisenhower administration, is to be found in the old and never-ending suspicion held by a free people of the expanding powers of a government centralized at a point farthest removed from their control or influence. "Every Federal grant," says Senator Byrd, "elevates the control of the Federal Government and subordinates the authority of the States." As the Virginia Senator points out—and as, strangely enough, it often seems needful to point out—"nothing is more true than that power follows the purse," or as the old saying has it, he who pays the fiddler calls the tune. The Federal Government, or one of the numerous bureaus of it, will say where the roads are to be built. It will say how many access roads shall be built and where. It will fix the fees for such activities as those of filling stations, motels, and restaurants—and will fix standards for their construction along the route of the highways. The people will pay, but having turned their funds over to the Federal Government for use and allocation, they will lose all say as to how it shall be spent. A Government bureau will pay the fiddler with their money and a Government bureau will call the tune. And it will be some tune.

The fiscal objections are several. Over a period of 30 years, Senator Byrd estimates, 3 percent interest on the proposed highway bonds would require repayment of \$1.55 for every dollar borrowed. That is the cost if the bonds are paid off at maturity, but that they would be paid off at maturity is "a violent assumption," since not a dollar of borrowed funds has been paid off by the Federal Government in 25 years. Rather it is likely that more billions will be called for. There is no such thing as a permanent road, and population shifts will call for changes in road locations. The United States Treasury, under a contract with the Federal corporation doing the road fund borrowing, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the obligation would not be "included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States," a fact which leads the Senator to the caustic comment that "you cannot avoid financial responsibility by ledgerdmain, and you cannot evade debt by definition." Annual appropriations for payment of principle and interest would have to be requested of the Congress but the Congress would be powerless to refuse the request. Under certain circumstances the corporation could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to \$5 billion outstanding at any one time. No wonder the Virginian calls these methods of financing "unique" and "unsound." No wonder he says "such procedures violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law." No wonder he is concerned because of the increases in the Federal debt and at the weakening of the budget system.

Applicable to both fiscal and political objections to the Clay Commission proposal is the fear, virtually the certainty, that if these procedures are followed for roadbuilding they will be followed for financing "endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc." If that happens, or when that happens, there will be no such thing as a balanced budget because there will be no budget and there will be no limit to the Federal debt, even the size of which will be a secret even to qualified accountants. And in the end the Federal Government will be all powerful, the States localities mere geographical boundaries.

Here is a proposal that has been set up to be shot at. Senator Byrd has taken the first shot, making a solid hit, and others

may be expected to follow. Members of the Congress will do well to give consideration to what these authorities have to say on the subject, and not let themselves be carried away by their enthusiasm for good roads—and for more pork barrels.

[From the Hopewell (Va.) News of January 18, 1955]

#### FEDERAL HIGHWAY PLAN FOR BORROWING UNSOUND

We are inclined to agree with Senator HARRY F. BYRD in opposing the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee for a National Highway program.

The committee's recommendations fall generally in two parts: (1) Continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of \$623 million a year, and (2) expenditure during the next 10 years of an additional \$25 billion for the so-called interstate highway system.

The committee estimates the \$25 billion would construct 40,000 miles of roads designated by the Federal Government as interstate highways. This would be a little more than 1 percent of all public road mileage. It would average out to about 800 miles per State. Virginia actually has a little over 900 miles.

#### BORROW \$20 BILLION

To finance this the committee recommends borrowing \$20 billion at 3 percent interest and collecting \$5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating on the rights-of-way. The committee's letter transmitting the report to the President implies that revenue from taxes on gasoline and lubricating oils will liquidate the program debt.

In regard to all this Senator Byrd says:

"Actually the committee recommends that the Federal Government assume virtually the complete obligation for the so-called interstate highway system (abolishing the 60-40 Federal-State matching requirement in this program) and that it be financed by methods which are unique so far as I know and thoroughly unsound.

The committee recommended to the President that the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow \$20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States."

#### MUST BE HONORED

"Annual appropriations to meet principal and interest payments would be requested, but the request could not be refused or reduced by subsequent Congresses, for 30 years, if the faith and credit of the Government are to be honored. If financial difficulty should develop at any time the corporation with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to \$5 billion outstanding at any one time.

"Such procedures violate financial principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law.

"If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc. In fact I am informed that such a plan is now under consideration for school construction."

#### BACK TO STATES

We feel that by far the best thing for the Federal Government to do is to give up the present 2-cent gasoline tax and let the States reimpose it. This would not increase the present cost to the motorist, yet would allow each State to greatly expand its highway

program. This would keep State control of our roads, and revenues would be evenly distributed over future years to keep our highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

As a matter of fact Senator Byrd proposes much the same thing, except that he would keep a Federal gasoline tax of one-half cent per gallon. He says this, with the present Federal lubricating oil tax, would pay for the present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems, on the present matching basis, which amounts to \$535 million a year.

However, we believe that it would be better for the Federal Government to drop the gasoline tax entirely and leave that field to the States. It is not earmarked for the Federal road program and it has been the policy of the Federal Government for many years to give some aid on highways on a matching basis. Let's continue it that way but give the States a chance to run their own show.

With the added revenue the States would have from the 2-cent gasoline tax, now imposed by the Federal Government, we believe that in the long run we would have a better system of highways.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News of January 19, 1955]

#### BYRD'S ALTERNATIVE

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, did not restrict himself to the role of critic when he attacked the Clay Commission proposals for Federal and State expenditures of \$101 billion in 10 years for roads and for Federal bonds to pay part of the costs. His comment was constructive as well as critical. In opposing one plan for highway construction he offered an alternative.

He proposes in brief that Federal aid to State roads be continued on the matching basis in the amount of \$535 million as at present and that this amount be raised from the proceeds of the present lubricating-oil tax and a one-half-a-cent-a-gallon Federal tax on gasoline. The present 2-cent Federal tax on gasoline he would repeal, permitting the States to add the difference to their own gasoline tax and spend the revenues according to their needs as they themselves define it.

The advantages of the Byrd plan, as he sees them, are that interest in the sum of more than \$11 billion would be saved for additional roads construction; the States would retain as much control over their roads as they have at present; and the revenues would be evenly distributed over future years to keep the highways modernized to meet changing conditions, instead of standardizing them to meet present conditions.

Senator Byrd says his plan will result in more road development than can be accomplished under the Clay Commission plan, and at the same time avoid the proposed increase in the public debt and preserve the soundness of the Federal budgetary system which is threatened by the commission's proposals.

Senator Byrd promises to elaborate in another statement, giving details and presenting figures on a yearly basis. Senator Byrd knows his roads from many years of study and of leadership in putting Virginia near the top of the States in highway construction. He knows his government finance, Federal and State. What he has to say is worth at least as much attention as the recommendations of a committee which spent a few months of study on the problems involved, and whose members, while able, are not all authorities.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News of January 20, 1955]

#### BETTER NOT START

If \$20 billion of 30-year highway bonds are issued by the Federal Government at 3 percent interest the roads built from the funds



thus obtained will cost \$1.55 for every dollar spent, it is estimated by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, who has carefully analyzed what he calls a unique and unsound financing scheme.

If the bonds are not paid at maturity, if only the interest is paid during that 30-year period, we will have to continue to pay interest and the cost will in time reach to \$2 and more for every dollar spent on roads. And we will still owe the \$20 billion, will still have our debt. But we won't have our roads. They will be outmoded in that time. There are no such things as permanent roads.

If we issue these bonds for highways, there will come proposals for issuing more bonds for other things—for schools, for hospitals, for health, for this, that, and the other things, some needed, some desirable, and some just excuses for pork barrels. The effect of that on our fiscal position can well be imagined.

Fanciful? We will pay our bonds?

We have not paid a cent on the Federal debt in 25 years, Senator BYRD points out in his blast against the grandiose proposal of the generals and the Army engineers. If we are looking for something fanciful, we may find it in the idea that the bonds will be paid at maturity.

The thought that various other projects will be proposed and, perhaps, adopted if this one goes through, is the product of groundless fear?

Already they are talking of bonds for construction of school buildings at the expense of the Federal Government. And if the door is opened now, they will get them, too.

These fears of an enormous increase in the national debt, of the virtual destruction of the budgetary system are justified by experience and by judgment based on the ways of a spendthrift government. To be sure they will never be justified by reality, let's just forget all about the whole thing. There's a lot better ways to build roads, anyway.

[From the Newport News (Va.) Times-Herald of January 17, 1955]

#### SENATOR BYRD'S ROAD PLAN

Over the weekend Senator BYRD, of Virginia made many worthwhile points in his statement in opposition to the national road-building plan submitted to President Eisenhower by his National Advisory Committee for a highway program. In a number of instances the comment was well-nigh devastating. Certainly it was most inclusive, as it attacked the two-part plan to continue regular Federal highway aid of \$623 million a year and expenditure during the next decade of \$25 billion derived from bonds for the "so-called Interstate Highway System."

Senator BYRD points out among other things that the 40,000 miles of road contemplated would, after all, represent but 1 percent of all public road mileage; that the \$20 billion it is planned to borrow would cost the taxpayers in interest \$1.55 for every dollar borrowed; that on past experience with Federal borrowing it could be assumed the debt would not be paid on schedule and that even before the 40,000 miles were constructed the program would be expanded into a still more costly venture.

He points to the changing needs for roads as population shifts, noting that it is difficult to pin down a special route as permanently good; that financing methods would abolish the present 60-40 percent matching program now in use for the "so-called interstate highway system" bringing into effect a unique system under which the whole obligation would be Federal—as would the determination of how the money would be spent and roads constructed.

The financing plan would be through a Federal corporation "without either assets or income" under contract with the Federal Government which would guarantee the cor-

poration's bonds. "Such procedures," says Senator BYRD, "violate financing principles, defy budgetary control and evade Federal-debt law."

Moreover, says he, this system of financing would be the entering wedge for all sorts of outlays—schools, hospitals, public health, and so on. Senator BYRD points in this connection to the growth of Federal grants in 21 years from \$126 million for 18 Federal grants in aid to today's \$3 billion for 50 programs.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative in repeal of the present 2-cents-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax, permitting the States to reimpose it; continuation of the present Federal aid of \$533 million allocated on a matching basis; continuance of the Federal lubricating oil tax and a half-cent Federal gasoline tax, which would let the Federal Government recoup its matching aid outlay.

The Virginia Senator says he will offer in the next few days a plan to get more road development than is possible under the committee's plan; to avoid public debt increase and retain a sound national budgetary system.

The fate of that plan has yet to be determined, of course. Yet Senator BYRD has offered many sound criticisms of the committee plan which should be most useful in making it eventually a down-to-earth program with its weaknesses and pitfalls well known. After all, no fiscal manipulation is going to abolish the hard fact that the taxpayers, one way or another, are going to pay for any roads built. Plans are simply patterned for spending these taxes, with the proper determining yardstick being the most of the most most-needed roads for the money without doing violence to sound financing methods.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot of January 18, 1955]

#### SENATOR BYRD'S DISSENT ON THE FEDERAL ROAD PLAN

That Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD should oppose the \$101 billion Federal-State highway program proposed by the President's National Advisory Commission on highways and endorsed by Mr. Eisenhower, will surprise no Virginians. Senator BYRD's opposition to bonds-for-roads traces back to the Virginia Democratic primary campaign of 1925 in which he won the nomination for Governor on the pay-as-you-go issue. His opponent, State Senator G. Walter Mapp, was for bonds-for-roads.

Senator BYRD's opposition to the Federal-State highway program is categorical, and every category of his argument against the plan must be met. He is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and in a position powerfully to influence the course of the legislation that would effectuate the program. His opposition to it is directed, first, at the central idea of the plan, which is to set up a Federal Highway Corporation to issue Government bonds in the amount of \$20 billion bearing 3 percent interest, and based on the Federal gasoline tax. This fund would provide part of an estimated \$25 million needed to construct 400,000 miles of interstate highways.

The remaining \$5 billion would be raised by a Federal tax on filling stations and motels along the highways. Mr. BYRD objects to this device for incurring a Government debt not chargeable against the national debt limit. The 30-year bonds to be issued would cost the taxpayers \$11.5 billion, which would mean that every dollar borrowed would cost \$1.55.

Senator BYRD argues there is no assurance the bonds would be paid when they matured. He cites the fact that not a single dollar of Federal debt has been paid off in 25 years.

As an alternative Senator BYRD proposes repealing the Federal gasoline tax of 2½

cents and permitting the States to reimpose it. No doubt many States would. But some would not. If they did reimpose the tax would they spend on the interstate highways the large sums required to keep them adequately maintained for the tremendous interstate traffic? These highways today are comparable to the rivers and waterways over which the Federal Government long ago assumed jurisdiction.

Interstate traffic has overleaped all planning estimates. Vast new construction on State and interstate highways is needed. This is the central fact that is being faced by every State legislature and that must be faced by Congress as it critically examines the President's multi-billion-dollar road program and ways and means of its financing.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of January 18, 1955]

#### BYRD CITES FALLACIES IN CLAY ROAD PLAN

Senator BYRD has put his finger on at least half a dozen glaring weaknesses in the Clay committee's highway-construction proposal and has pointed out several other phases of the plan which raise serious doubts as to its soundness.

Perhaps the worst aspect is the basic financing proposal, calling for creation of a brandnew Federal corporation which would issue 30-year bonds to raise money for construction of a 40,000-mile interstate highway system. In previous editorials we have cited this and other shortcomings in the Clay plan, but Senator BYRD has delved deeper into the financial angles and come up with some interesting figures.

Setting up the corporation would be a scheme to get around the Federal debt limit. But the United States Treasury would guarantee the corporation's bonds; and if financial difficulties should develop, the corporation could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to \$5 billion outstanding at any one time.

This type of financing would cost the citizens \$1.55 for every dollar borrowed if the bonds carry 3 percent interest, which is a reasonable figure to anticipate.

This "keeping two sets of books" would deprive the taxpayer of a true and realistic account of the Government's fiscal affairs, and would impair Federal credit by methods which would be condemned as dishonest in private business.

"You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain," says the Senator. "You cannot evade debt by definition."

Nor would the Federal Government exercise budgetary control over the spending of the borrowed funds—a perilous precedent, which would almost certainly be followed in the financing of what Mr. BYRD fears would be "endless Federal outlays for education, hospitals, public health, etc." He has been told that a plan similar to that proposed by the Clay committee is now under consideration for school construction.

Another basic fallacy in the plan is that it proposes a gigantic 10-year building program that would eat up all available funds for the interstate system for 30 years. Road needs change constantly; it would be more sensible to spend less each year and have enough for a continuing construction program.

Senator BYRD offers an alternate plan for road financing.

He proposes that the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it, and that a Federal gas tax of one-half cent be adopted. (The wording of his proposal implies a net increase of one-half cent in gasoline taxes, including both State and Federal.) He says the Federal tax on gas, along with the tax on lubricating oil, would finance continuation of the present Federal road-grants program.

The Senator will furnish further details of his plan later. Suffice it to say now, however, that such a plan obviously would save billions in interest which would have to be paid under the Clay proposal, and would spread out road work more evenly over a longer period.

His plan may not be the ultimate answer, but it is far superior to the recommendation of the Clay group.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times of January 18, 1955]

#### SENATOR BYRD'S ALTERNATIVE TO THE CLAY ROAD PROGRAM

Senator BYRD's proposed substitute for the Eisenhower-Clay plan of Federal stimulation of road building recognizes the importance of highways and the extent to which we are falling behind in their development. It reiterates the Senator's long held conviction against any increase in the Federal debt, direct or indirect.

The Byrd plan depends on two contingencies:

1. That the Congress will agree to repeal of the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax, and so permit its reimposition by the States. It was because he had been told by his former associates in the House of Representatives that this would not be done that Governor Stanley gave preliminary approval to the Clay Commission plan. In Washington it is agreed that if any plan to remit the Federal gasoline tax is presented, the Congress will be deluged with appeals for remission or reduction of other burdensome excise taxes.

2. That the States can be induced to devote this extra revenue to roads carrying the most traffic instead of to those producing the most votes. The Virginia budget is loaded with diversions and charges on the road fund, for criminal expenses and many other matters having little if any relation to roads. The latest such charge is \$400,000 for a State office building in Richmond, in which the highway department will not be housed.

While it is true that Virginia has the maintenance and policing of both primary and secondary highways before any new construction can be financed it is a curious commentary that Senator BYRD believes that from a ½-cent gasoline tax, plus a Federal tax on fuel oil, the Federal Government can match 50-50, or in the case of interstate highways 60-40, all major construction that Virginia undertakes out of a present 6-cent or a proposed 7½-cent gasoline tax.

Total traffic on our roads has doubled in recent years. But this increase has not been uniform. Some roads are much more overloaded than others. Our rigid plan of allocation makes no concession to changing conditions.

It is agreed that old U. S. 1 from Washington to Carolina by Richmond is obsolete, overloaded, and has the highest accident rate in the State. Under present plans, or under Senator BYRD's proposal, its replacement, with a modern divided-lane limited access road would take the entire construction fund for many years, bringing all other road work in the State to a standstill.

U. S. 11 from above Winchester to Bristol has some improved sections, some 2-lane bottlenecks, but is for most of its 300 miles an obsolete overloaded 3-lane road. Under the present plan of doing a little work each year in 3 districts it cannot be modernized for 30 or 40 years, and that only by restricting much needed work elsewhere.

It is true, as Senator BYRD points out, that if the Federal Government undertakes to modernize 40,000 miles of interstate roads, 910 miles of which are in Virginia, from a \$25 billion bond issue, there would be constant and insistent demands to have other important roads included in the interstate system. As the Senator knows, we started in Virginia with a 3,000-mile primary system

and have brought it to nearly 9,000 miles since 1918. Yet we are still without an adequate safe road from Roanoke to Lynchburg, or from Roanoke to the North Carolina border—both of which roads were in the original primary system.

The Clay Commission holds that we are approaching a crisis—a possible breakdown of transportation in time of war, and a constant brake on our economic development in time of peace. Senator BYRD recognizes no such crisis. Opposing any use of credit, Federal or State, he would increase State funds by remission of three-fourths of the Federal gasoline tax, without any guaranty that priority would be given either to interstate roads or to those most overloaded.

We have waited a long time for roads promised when the pay-as-you-go system was adopted, and which have not yet been supplied. Can we afford another generation of delay, inaction, heavy accident toll, and delayed economic development?

#### ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Monday it is planned to have a call of the calendar from the beginning.

If it is not disposed of on the call of the calendar, it is my intention to call up Calendar No. 122, Senate Resolution 72, authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigation by the Committee on Armed Services.

I give notice now, so that Senators who are interested may read the announcement in the RECORD, that later in the week, probably on Tuesday or Wednesday, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendars Nos. 107, 108, 109, 110, and 111, which are, respectively, Senate bills 1325, 1326, 1327, 1436, and 1457, the five tobacco bills introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Following the disposition of those bills I expect to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the military-pay bill, hearings on which have been completed. I understand the bill will be marked up the early part of next week.

#### THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, all of us are very much interested in the Reserve components of the United States. Those components include the National Guard of the United States and the Organized Reserves of the United States.

The National Guard recently released a concise statement of what the Guard has done from the days of the Revolution to the present time. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### I AM THE GUARD

Civilian in peace, soldier in war; of security and honor, for three centuries I have been the custodian. I am the guard.

I was with Washington in the dim forests, fought the wily warrior, and watched the dark night bow to the morning. At Concord's bridge, I fired the fateful shot heard around the world. I bled on Bunker Hill. My footprints marked the snows at Valley Forge. I pulled a muffled oar on the barge that bridged the icy Delaware. I stood with Washington on the sun-drenched heights of Yorktown. I saw the sword surrendered. I am the guard. I pulled the trigger that loosed the long rifle's havoc at New Orleans. These things I knew. I was there. I saw both sides of the War Between the States. I was there. The hill at San Juan felt the fury of my charge. The far plains and mountains of the Philippines echoed my shout. On the Mexican border I stood. I am the guard. The dark forest of the Argonne blazed with my barrage. Cheateau Thierry crumbled to my cannonade. Under the arches of victory I marched in legion. I was there. I am the guard. I bowed briefly on the grim Corregidor, then saw the light of liberation shine on the faces of my comrades. Through the jungle and on the beaches, I fought the enemy, beat, battered, and broke him. I raised our banner to the serene air on Okinawa. I scrambled over Normandy's beaches. I was there. I am the guard. Across the 38th parallel I made my stand. I flew MIG Alley. I was there. I am the guard.

Soldier in war, civilian in peace. I am the guard.

I was at Johnstown, where the raging waters boomed down the valley. I cradled the crying child in my arms and saw the terror leave her eyes. I moved through smoke and flame at Texas City. The stricken knew the comfort of my skill. I dropped the food that fed the starving beast on the frozen fields of the West and through the towering drifts I ploughed to rescue the marooned. I have faced forward to the tornado, the typhoon, and the horror of the hurricane and flood; these things I know. I was there. I am the guard. I have brought a more abundant, a fuller, a finer life to our youth. Wherever a strong arm and valiant spirit must defend the Nation, in peace or war, wherever a child cries, or a woman weeps in time of disaster, there I stand. I am the guard. For three centuries a soldier in war, a civilian in peace, of security and honor, I am the custodian, now and forever. I am the guard.

#### EASTER RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is tentatively planned that the Senate will recess from Thursday before Good Friday until Tuesday following Easter.

I should like to state for the information of Senators, however, that it does not appear now that the so-called reciprocal trade bill will be reported by that time and be ready for consideration by the Senate. Discussions are under way with the chairmen of committees, with respect to what legislation will be ready for action by the Senate by that time, with the thought of exploring the possibility of taking a somewhat more extended recess over the Easter period. I hope to be able to make an announcement to the Senate on Monday next in that regard.



Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Texas can give us a little information as to whether the additional time for a recess would be prior to Easter or after Easter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not have a calendar before me, but it is my understanding that the House will be in recess from Monday, April 4, I believe, until Wednesday, April 13. If no important legislation is ready for consideration by the Senate during that period, and if the distinguished minority leader is agreeable, it is possible that the Senate may take a recess for the same period.

The minority leader is now discussing the question with some of the ranking minority members, and as soon as he informs me of his desires I shall be prepared to act.

#### TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a \$20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a \$20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

HARRY F. BYRD,  
WALTER F. GEORGE  
(By HARRY F. BYRD),  
ROBERT S. KERR,  
E. D. MILLIKIN,  
EDWARD MARTIN,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

JERE COOPER,  
W. D. MILLS,  
DANIEL A. REED,  
THOMAS A. JENKINS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the conference report agrees to the Senate amendment striking out the \$20 credit provided in the House bill. The conferees agreed to the bill as passed by the Senate. I may say that the conferees on the part of the Senate voted unani-

mously in favor of the conference report, and of the 5 conferees on the part of the House, 4 signed the conference report.

The facts surrounding the bill are well known to the Senate. An amendment was adopted by the House granting a \$20 income-tax credit. That amendment was rejected by the Committee on Finance, and when the same amendment was offered on the floor of the Senate it was rejected by the Senate by a vote of 61 to 32.

The bill as it now stands provides only for a continuation for 1 year of the excise taxes, which expire on March 31, and for a continuation for 1 year of the 5 percent corporation taxes, which also expire on March 31. In other words, both taxes will be continued for another year, until March 31, 1956. There are no other provisions in the bill or in the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 28, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 25 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

##### IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Robert Alexis McClure, O6785, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

##### To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John William Harmony, O15240, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Richard Givens Prather, O15698, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, O16761, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Edward Martin, O16802, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Derrill McCollough Daniel, O29500, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

##### To be brigadier generals

Col. Benjamin Peter Heiser, O16450, United States Army.

Col. Arthur Hodgkins Bender, O16611, United States Army.

Col. Theodore Trower King, O28889, United States Army.

Col. Harry Oliver Paxson, O16764, United States Army.

Col. James Virgil Thompson, O16826, United States Army.

Col. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, O17075, United States Army.

Col. Ernest Fred Easterbrook, O18537, United States Army.

Col. William Leonard Hardick, O18558, United States Army.

Col. John Frank Ruggles, O18596, United States Army.

Col. James Winfield Coutts, O18875, United States Army.

The following-named person for appointment as chaplain of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of captain, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Murphy, John J., O966609.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

##### To be captains

Fisher, William C., MC, O979020.

Patow, Warren E., MC, O1920876.

White, Stanley W., MC, O932416.

##### To be first lieutenants

Bingham, Wilbur G., Jr., MC, O4022519.

Carnes, Marion M., MC.

Jackson, Peter E., MC.

##### To be second lieutenants

Kellel, Frank, Jr., MSC, O2103085.

MacTaggart, Lois, WMSC, M2972.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Blakely, Gene T., O4024526.

Cheitlin, Melvin D., O2273754.

Ford, George L., Jr.

Green, David C., O4038709.

Potenza, Austin D., O2273865.

Scalettar, Raymond, AO3000295.

Schonholtz, George J., O2273730.

Wayman, George W., O2063133.

Weinstein, David B., O2273765.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 4, 1955, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Everett, William M., O4009342.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Hymes, Morris A. Stein, David W.,

Jackson, Donald, O4017794.

O4042676. Twachtman, Dale H.

Petracek, Daniel L. Wharrie, Robert E.

Rajski, Daniel J.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

##### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following persons for permanent appointment to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications provided by law:

##### To be captains

Riley J. Sipe, effective March 2, 1955.

Frank G. Johnson, in accordance with law.

*To be ensigns*

Robert J. Candela, effective March 21, 1955.  
Willard L. Shireman, in accordance with law.  
James F. Schumann, in accordance with law.  
Norman B. Madsen, in accordance with law.

*IN THE ARMY*

Maj. Gen. Silas Beach Hays, O17803, Medical Corps, United States Army, to be the Surgeon General, United States Army.

Lt. Gen. Lyman Louis Lemnitzer, O12687, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be commanding general, Army Forces Far East and Eighth Army, with the rank of general, and as general in the Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, O17676, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Research, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

Capt. Amos A. Jordan, Jr., O27895, to be professor of social science, United States Military Academy, effective March 1, 1955.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

*To be captain*

Powell, John J., VC, O427930.

*To be first lieutenants*

Benedict, Daniel B., MC, O999420.

Gibson, Jack L., MC, O1940129.

Godfrey, William H., MSC, O1546995.

Gunuskey, Dolores L., ANC, N762590.

Lysak, William, MSC, O966641.

The following-named person for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

*To be first lieutenant*

Griffin, Martin E., Jr., O4030389.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

*To be first lieutenants*

Cluck, Charlie E., O999028.

Madden, William R., Jr., O975483.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

*To be second lieutenant*

Dillard, Herbert A.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

*To be second lieutenants*

Bittl, Frederick E. Kennedy, George I. Jr.,

Fitter, Patrick M. O1941273.

Garcia, Eliseo J., Nack, Thomas P.,

O4024771. O4044536.

Heverly, Clifford C., Purdy, Harry E., Jr.,

O401726. O4025765.

Turner, Joseph E., Jr.

*REGULAR AIR FORCE*

The nominations of Robert Wesley Tindall, et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force,

which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 14, 1955, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Robert Wesley Tindall, which is shown on page 2832 and ending with the name of Elbert Ray Chamlis, which appears on page 2833.

**SENATE**

MONDAY, MARCH 28, 1955

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Teach us to toil and ask not for reward save that of knowing we do the things that please Thee. May we regard the faithful service of the Commonwealth as a sacramental task.

As we come now, at the beginning of another week, to the high altar of patriotism in this temple of the people's hope and trust, may it be with clear minds, clean hands, and courageous hearts. Thou hast taught us that our lives are the temples of Thy holy presence. Made in Thy image, no despot may enslave our conscience. Against the defilement, by impious hands, of that sacred inner shrine, we pledge a sacrifice from which no Gethsemane or Calvary can hold us back. Strengthen us with the spirit of that One who, for the joy that was set before Him, endured the shame and despised the cross. In His name we ask it. Amen.

**THE JOURNAL**

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 25, 1955, was dispensed with.

**MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—  
ENROLLED BILL SIGNED**

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 691) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancon No. 877 at Baytown, Tex., and certain tank cars, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 2½ hours this afternoon so that I may greet Miss Jody Folsom, former potato queen of North Dakota, and a typical beauty from our

North Dakota prairies, who represents the State of North Dakota in the Cherry Blossom Festival, and who, I hope, will be elected queen of the festival. She is arriving on the Northwest Airlines to be a charming guest of the North Dakota congressional delegation, who will meet her in a body, and as senior Senator I have the pleasant job of pinning an orchid on her shoulder.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from North Dakota will be excused from attending the session of the Senate today for 2½ hours for the purpose indicated.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING  
SENATE SESSION**

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate through Thursday of this week.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Welfare Pensions of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

**ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF  
ROUTINE BUSINESS**

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE  
ON ARMED SERVICES TO REPORT  
BILL DURING RECESS OR AD-  
JOURNMENT OF THE SENATE**

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to report the military pay bill, H. R. 4720, on Tuesday in the event the Senate shall not be in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if the committee shall report the military pay bill, the Senate may proceed to its consideration immediately after the morning hour on Wednesday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.